

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EXECUTIVE TESTIMONY
DO NOT DISSEMINATE

Date May 9, 1958

New York, New York

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY
Official Reporters
306 Ninth Street, N. W.

Tel:
NA

Table of Contents

Proceedings of the Subcommittee of
the Committee on Un-American Activities

New York, N. Y.

House of Representatives

May 9, 1938

	<u>P</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E</u>
<i>Index</i> Testimony of Charles Rindone				2
Statement of James J. Mackin				46
Testimony of Charles Rindone (Resumed)				47
<i>Index</i> Testimony of John J. Nolan				51
Testimony of Mrs. Mildred B. Blauvelt				56
Testimony of John J. Nolan (Resumed)				70
✓ Testimony of Mrs. Sonia Osler <i>atly</i>				108
<i>Index</i> Testimony of Herman J. Smith				117

EXECUTIVE SESSION - ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1958

United States House of Representatives,
Subcommittee of the Committee on
Un-American Activities,
New York, New York.

The Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:00 a. m., in Room 129, Federal Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, New York, Hon. Moran M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Moran M. Moulder (Missouri), presiding, Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney (New York), Gordon H. Scherer (Ohio).

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Counsel; Dolores Scotti, Investigator.

Mr. Kearney (presiding). The Subcommittee will be in order.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Rindone, will you come forward, please?

Mr. Kearney. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Rindone. I do.

Mr. Tavenner. What is your name, please, sir?

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES RINDONE,
2120 - 33rd ROAD,
LONG ISLAND 6, NEW YORK.

Mr. Rindone. I live at 2120 - 33rd Road, Long Island City 6, New York. My occupation is Special Officer at present employed by the Department of Welfare. I am forty-seven years of age.

Mr. Tavenner. How long have you been employed by the Department of Welfare.

Mr. Rindone. Since June 15, 1935.

Mr. Tavenner. Is that the Department of Welfare of the City of New York?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. What is the general character of work that you perform in the Department of Welfare?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I maintain law and order in the Welfare Department. I am employed at one of the welfare centers, namely, the Yorkville Welfare Center at 154 East 68th Street.

Mr. Tavenner. Have your duties been substantially the same since you were first employed by the Department of Welfare?

Mr. Rindone. No, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. What were your duties between 1936 and 1940?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I can relate the jobs that I had.

I first started as a junior clerk and then I became a unit clerk. That was the senior clerk. Then I became a principal clerk, and then, with the question of civil service

entering the picture, we all had to take various
and I became a messenger, a payroll messenger, and
from payroll messenger I became at that time the
known as Special Patrolman. Now it has been reclassified and
is known as Special Officer.

Mr. Tavenner. Over the period of 1935 to 1940, what was
the character of the positions that you held?

Mr. Rindone. Well, between '34 and '40 I was junior
clerk, unit clerk, and messenger.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Rindone, during the period of your
employment by the city of New York, have you at any time been
a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, I have.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, when
that membership began and when it terminated, if it did termi-
nate?

Mr. Rindone. Well, in order to refresh my memory I made
a few notes here. I joined the Communist Party in 1936.

Mr. Tavenner. How long did you remain in the Communist
Party?

Mr. Rindone. Well, as far as I was concerned I would like
to project here a parenthesis. You see, nobody resigned from
the Communist Party. There is no such thing and, as far as I
was concerned, I didn't attend any more meetings or have anything
to do with the Communist Party beginning in or around 1941.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, will you tell us the circumstances under which you became a member and then later I will want to ask you what considerations there were that took you out of the Party.

Mr. Rindone. Well, I was employed at an office of the then predecessor to the Department of Welfare, called the Emergency Relief Bureau, and as I previously stated, I was a junior clerk, and after I was employed there a few weeks, I was approached by various people telling me that if we formed an employees' organization we would have a better lot and things would be better, and I went ahead and signed up many of the employees in this labor organization as it were, called the Association of Workers in Public Relief Agencies.

I did so well at that and I used to collect maybe a hundred dollars each pay day, et cetera, that I was finally invited to some of the employees' homes and, after about two invitations, I myself did not realize what the set-up actually was until much later on.

I was twenty-four years of age and I didn't realize what these people were really up to.

However, after two invitations, I was asked to join the Communist Party. They sold me a bill of goods on it. I thought it was a good thing. They said it was for a better America, it was going to help people out of work, and so forth and so on, and, not knowing full the conspiratorial aspect of this kind of

a political party, I willingly joined and signed a Communist Party card, application.

Mr. Tavenner. That was in 1936?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell us who was instrumental in getting you to become a member of the Party?

Mr. Rindone. Well, it was a Mr. Sidney Alexander who evidently -- I only found this out later on -- it seems the he was assigned to develop me. I didn't know that.

He took me to lunch and invited me to his home and went out socially with me and he evidently had the task of developing me. I didn't know that.

At his home one evening at 11th Street and Second Avenue at the Stuyvesant Apartments, I was asked to join the Communist Party, and he signed, he sponsored me. You see, you have to have a sponsor. He sponsored my application, and I became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Tavenner. Was this man, Alexander, an employee of the City Government?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. In what capacity?

Mr. Rindone. He was social investigator employed at the same agency, 208 East 23rd Street.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, were you assigned to a group of the Communist Party at that time or a particular cell?

Mr. Rindone. Well, at that particular time, the Emergency Relief Bureau was set up on the basis of one office for each police precinct in the city which mean 99 precincts and they opened offices wherever they could.

As far as my knowledge of the doings of the Communist Party was concerned in the Emergency Relief Bureau, each office had its own distinct Communist Party cell.

Mr. Tavenner. When you met with this group upon your first becoming made a member of the Communist Party, will you tell us about how many persons were present and who they were, as far as you can remember?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir. At the meeting which took place in Sidney Alexander's home, as I previously stated, there was his brother-in-law, Gilbert Kahn, K-a-h-n. He was also a social investigator.

I later found out that that was his brother-in-law.

Mr. Tavenner. May I interrupt a moment?

If any of the people whose names you are going to give us are presently employed by the City Government or have been up to a recent period, I would like for you to state it as a descriptive matter of the individual.

Mr. Rindone. I will, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Is that particular person, Mr. Kahn, employed now by the City Government, or has he been employed recently?

Mr. Rindone. Well, my last contact with Mr. Kahn, of my

own knowledge, I know he was a member of the Welfare Department, but I don't know where he is working now.

Mr. Tavenner. At how late a period was it that he was connected with the Welfare Department?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I know he was connected with the Welfare Department up to about, I would say, as far as my knowledge is concerned 1939, you see, because this particular office I mentioned moved from those premises and I was transferred to another office.

Mr. Tavenner. Very well. Will you proceed now?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir. Another person who was present at the meeting was Sidney Goldring. He evidently had an apartment in the same building which I later found out and his wife was employed also by the Welfare Department. The latest information available to me on Mr. Goldring is that he was still with the Welfare Department. However, I heard that he was brought up on trial of some sort by the Department and dismissed.

Mr. Tavenner. About when? About how long ago?

Mr. Rindone. Well, to search my memory, it is quite some time ago. It was in various publications that he was tried and dismissed by the Department of Welfare. I would say roughly around the year '42.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you know whether or not membership in the Communist Party had anything to do with his expulsion or

dismissal?

Mr. Rindone. No, I don't really know because I don't know of anyone person in all the years that I have been employed by the Department of Welfare who has been fired for being a Communist.

Mr. Tavenner. All right. Will you proceed, please?

Mr. Rindone. The other person that I recall was Harry Solotarow. He was then a Social Investigator and at the present time I know that he is working with the New York City Housing Authority as an Assistant Housing Manager. I believe he works in one of the developments in Harlem.

Mr. Tavenner. I think I should state for the record, Mr. Chairman, that according to our information that individual has now left the Communist Party.

All right. Will you proceed, please?

Mr. Rindone. Another person who was present was Mrs. Harry Solotarow. That was the wife of Harry Solotarow. Her name was Josephine Ellobogen. The best spelling I have is E-i-l-o-b-o-g-e-n. She was with the Welfare Department.

The last I have heard she still was with the Department of Welfare.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, the person who was assigned to the task of conditioning you for the Communist Party, you said, was Mr. Sidney Alexander?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell us whether or not he continued in the employment of the City Government, whether he is now so employed, if you know?

Mr. Rindone. Well, he worked for Welfare and then I don't know just what happened to him because the last time I met him I met him at one of our offices on Henry Street and he was telling somebody how he was in Paris, and so forth, and so on, and from other discussions which I had I was led to believe that he was no longer with the Welfare Department.

Mr. Tavenner. Very well. Will you continue?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Another person who was present was Samuel Shapiro. He was an investigator and he was working with the Welfare Department. The last I heard of Mr. Shapiro was through Federal authorities who claimed that he worked for the Federal Government.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you know in what capacity or in what department of the Federal Government he was employed?

Mr. Rindone. No, I do not. I was asked by Federal authorities to appear at a loyalty hearing for this person but I declined because I realized that the Department of Welfare was in the hands of the Communist Party and at that point I felt that this was more or less handpicking of an individual and the City, State, and Federal authorities weren't sincere in actually doing the job on the Communist Party as such.

Mr. Kearney. Did I understand you to say that the City

and Federal authorities were not sincere?

Mr. Rindone. That is my opinion, sir, and I hate to say that.

Mr. Scherer. Did you say both City and Federal?

Mr. Rindone. City, State, and Federal authorities.

Mr. Kearney. What year was this?

Mr. Rindone. Well, the meeting we are speaking of took place in 1936. When I was invited to appear at a loyalty hearing for Mr. Samuel Shapiro, I would say was around 1949 or thereabouts.

Mr. Kearney. All right. Proceed.

Mr. Tavenner. Continue, please.

Do you know whether or not as a result of the loyalty hearing that was given Mr. Shapiro was discharged from the service?

Mr. Rindone. No, I don't, but I knew this: that the Communist Party which was still then in the Welfare Department, running pretty much under the aegis of the United Public Workers, printed in one of their publications something to the effect that I had something to do with a loyalty hearing of one of their employees. I have a copy of that at home. I could show it to the committee.

Mr. Tavenner. If you will, show it to the investigator, please.

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir. You asked me a question, if I knew

what happened to Mr. Shapiro. I don't know what happened to Mr. Shapiro. I assume that he is still working for the Federal Government. The people that approached me to testify I never asked questions of.

I will be very frank, I have been kind of burned out about this whole thing. Everybody is playing patsy with the whole thing and it is kind of ridiculous. We are losing the fight.

Mr. Tavenner. All right. Will you proceed now, please?

Mr. Rindone. Another person who was present was Selma Deitch. She later married Samuel Shapiro. She was a clerk with the Department of Welfare. The last I heard she had a baby. She resigned from the Department of Welfare. She is a housewife.

The next person that I recall was Seymour, called Sy for short, Shute. He was an investigator for the Department of Welfare and the last I heard on an authoritative source he was a probation officer in the New York City courts.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, when would you place that position as probation officer of the New York City courts?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I want to tell you very frankly I appeared before the Commissioner of Investigations in the city of New York and I was shown a picture of Mr. Shute, if I know him, and they said -- and when I say "they," I mean Mr. Daniel O'Connor, Secretary of the Commission of Investigations, said that Mr. Shute is working for the Probation Department as a

Probation Officer. This was about a year ago.

Mr. Tavenner. He was a member of this group of the Communist Party with you?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. How late would you put his membership in your group?

Mr. Rindone. Well, my last contact with these particular groups of people terminated when, as I say, this office was closed and I was transferred to another office on or about the year '39.

Mr. Tavenner. Have you had any association with him in the Communist Party since 1939?

Mr. Rindone. No, thank God.

Mr. Tavenner. All right, sir.

Mr. Rindone. Another person who was present at this meeting was Russel Thayer. That is T-h-a-y-e-r. He was sort of an assistant supervisor at that time in this Emergency Relief Bureau. The last information that I had from Mr. Thayer was given to me by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Mr. Thayer spoke to the Federal Bureau of Investigation but he wouldn't unless his attorney was present.

His attorney was present and he spoke to the Bureau and I understand from one of the agents that he went back to the Harvard Law School and that he had broken with the Communist Party.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you know in what capacity he went back to the Harvard Law School?

Mr. Rindone. No, sir, but I understand that that is a school where they teach law mostly.

Mr. Kearney. They teach what?

Mr. Rindone. Law.

Mr. Tavenner. Very well.

Mr. Rindone. That is about all the people that I recall at this particular meeting where I was inducted into the Communist Party. Of course, I did meet other people at other times in the same apartment.

Mr. Tavenner. Well, I would like to know the names of other persons who were members of this group or became members from time to time.

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Although they may not have been present at that first meeting.

Mr. Rindone. All right.

Mr. Kearney. You are asking now only for those names who were known to the witness to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes, I want you to be very careful about that. We are asking about those that you, of your own knowledge, can identify as members of your own Communist Party group.

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir. I understand the question.

Later at meetings there was a Frances Herman, H-e-r-m-a-n, the best spelling I can remember. She was a secretary to the office manager of the office at 208 East 23rd Street at the time.

Mr. Tavenner. Proceed.

Mr. Rindone. Another person who I knew as a Communist was Lawrence Kammet, K-a-m-m-e-t. He was then an investigator at the same office, 208 East 23rd Street. I had a position of unit clerk which was a position of a clerical nature which did clerical work for eight social investigators and in this position I was able to carry a little weight because I had some charge of the distribution of the work. Having been made a member of the Communist Party I became enthused, and started to sign up some people into the Communist Party, recruit them.

Mr. Tavenner. That was an advantage that the Communist Party had was to have a person who was a member in a responsible position of that character where they could very easily influence others?

Mr. Rindone. Always, even today. So that I recruited Lawrence Kammet to the Communist Party. The last I heard of Mr. Kammet, he wasn't working for the Department of Welfare.

However, on January 10th, 1951, I appeared at the CIO headquarters in Washington, D.C., at which time I testified against Abram Flaxer, the International President of the United Public Workers, and at this hearing was Lawrence Kammet.

The Chairman at that time of this closed hearing was Mr. Rieve, Textile Workers, and I remember telling Mr. Rieve, the Chairman, while I was on the witness chair that I had recruited Lawrence Kammet who was in our presence.

The International President of the United Public Workers Abram Flaxer made a statement to the effect that I must be mistaken because Mr. Kammet was the editor of the Public Record. I understand it is a Midwestern communist newspaper.

Another person who I knew as a Communist was also another one of my so-called recruits. His name was Alexander Sacks.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. Rindone. It is S-a-c-k-s.

Alexander Sacks was an attorney also employed in the Department of Welfare as a social investigator. He was assigned to my particular unit and I was given orders by the Communist Party to work on him and finally I signed him up into the Communist Party.

As I recall he was a pretty disillusioned fellow and didn't like the Consolidated Edison Company because they didn't give him a job.

However, Mr. Sacks finally wound up in the Justice Department of the Federal Government, the Antitrust Division. I recall he made several trips while in this position to New York to see me. He took me to lunch and I, at that point, was

wondering what this guy was up to.

However, I didn't say or do anything about any of this business until such time as a Mr. Stokes in the World Telegram and Sun, a feature writer for that paper wrote a very sad, sobbing story about Alexander Sacks, who was attacking the Under Secretary of War in Germany and Mr. Draper on the cartel issue in Germany.

At that point I had a revulsion in my stomach that I couldn't stand and I got in touch with the Federal authorities and they in turn came to my home and I explained everything about Mr. Sacks because at that point I felt that this whole thing was going too far.

I understand from some of the Federal agents that he was brought back from Germany, suspended. The suspension was lifted by Harry Truman, through President Harry Truman through, I forget his title, his name is Gordon Gray. He lifted the suspension.

Mr. Kearney. That was the Secretary of War?

Mr. Rindone. At that time, sir. This is all in the morgue of the New York Times. I had much literature on it but it was many years ago, 1948. They lifted his suspension and brought him back from Germany and I felt sick again at my stomach. There was nothing I could do about it. The last I heard from a Federal investigator, he lived on East 57th Street in Manhattan. I don't know just what he is doing today.

Mr. Kearney. He became a Federal investigator, this Sacks?

Mr. Rindone. He became an attorney for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Tavenner. All right.

Mr. Rindone. Those were about all the people that I can recall. There probably were a half dozen others who came and went.

Mr. Tavenner. Yes. Can you tell me who took the lead in those meetings? Who were the individuals who had the greatest responsibility in this group?

Mr. Rindone. Well, the senior members of this group or the leaders, as you say, were usually Sidney Alexander, Gilbert Kahn, who was the Marxist of the group, Sidney Goldring. They would rotate the chairmanships, evidently, at every meeting. You know the Communist Party meets every Tuesday night all over the world and every Tuesday's meeting would see a different chairman. That is to give them the experience in case one fellow drops out. Others who were leaders of the group was this Russel Thayer. That is about the group of people who led this particular cell of the Communist Party.

Mr. Tavenner. I believe I am correct in my recollection of your testimony that all of these persons were city employees?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Was your group confined to persons employed by the city government?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir, at the place of my employment all people who belonged to the Communist Party were employed by the Emergency Relief Bureau and its successor, the Department of Welfare, which started on January 1st, 1939.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, what were the principal objectives of this group of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. If you do not mind, sir, I would like to give you a little more on the previous question concerning the leaders of the group. I see in my thoughts that I have additional information.

Mr. Tavenner. Yes.

Mr. Rindone. Customarily, the chairman, as I said, would have a letter or directive from the Communist Party which he, of course, destroyed immediately after it was read to the members. The directives were instructions as to the activities that the members were to participate in and these, of course, would be forthcoming weekly. They were activities, I recall, like joining the picket line in the strikes against the Automat, for example. Others I remember was a strike against Ohrbach's, the department store on 14th Street, at which point I recall very distinctly we were given orders to stay on the picket line even though the police requested us to disperse, and we were told that even if the police tell us to disperse we should stay on the picket line and be arrested, for which I was arrested with several others. I recall Alexander Sacks was

one, Samuel Shapiro and a few others, Josephine Ellbogen. But, of course, when we were arrested, the Communist Party arranged for bail, et cetera, and it was an open and closed shop. There was no two ways about it. It was strictly a Communist Party affair.

At other times I recall that there was a Western Union strike and we were told at these Communist Party meetings on Tuesday that especially those investigators who are out on the field should participate in the Western Union picket line.

I can see a good reason how why they did it with Joseph Sealey and company running that whole Western Union. I didn't realize myself what it was really all about. I thought it was more or less a labor dispute to better the working man's lot, et cetera. There were other instructions. For example, I was assigned at one point to attend an open street meeting at which I was to do my best to disrupt this meeting. It was a meeting which took place. I remember it was on Third Avenue in the Thirties. It might have been 36th Street or 37th Street. The speaker, I remember, was a Catholic priest, and several others who were speaking against the Nazi pact that Russia had with Nazi Germany, and the Communist Party unbeknownst to me had other people in this particular crowd who did their best to start the disruption of this meeting, and as I recall, the police were called out, squad cars, the microphone was bent, and the meeting was a shambles.

This was one of the other things that the Communist Party instructed their members to do, breakup these kinds of meetings. They heckled the speaker as I remember, and used violence in disrupting the meeting. You could see vegetables flying, carrots, et cetera, and as I say, the microphone was bent by the time the meeting ended.

I cannot help but remember that Catholic priest who was talking on the dais at that point.

Otherwise the meetings followed the ordinary course.

Mr. Kearney. Let me interrupt there. You speak about the Catholic priest talking on a dais at that particular point. Their pattern has not changed any up to the present time, has it, as far as all clergymen are concerned?

Mr. Rindone. That is right.

Mr. Kearney. They are atheists to start with. They have no use for religion and are trying to abolish religion all over the world, are they not?

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir. Because of their material belief they do not believe in religion. You can see what they are doing in Poland.

Mr. Kearney. Of course, some of these so-called believers in communism, if the day ever comes when they think they will take over this country, will abolish religion here, too.

Mr. Rindone. That is right. They will put us all in chains.

Mr. Scherer. Not all, except the Cyrus Eatons who have served their cause so well.

Mr. Tavenner. During the period of your membership, was there any discussion about the need for strong communist organization within any particular departments of the city government?

Mr. Rindone. Will you rephrase that a little?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes. I said during the period of your membership did the Communist Party discuss the need for stronger organization within any of the departments of the city government, such as Federal Housing or Public Housing?

Mr. Rindone. Well, to be factual and to be truthful, we never had much of a communist problem. I am answering your question. We have never had much of a communist problem before 1936 but believe it or not, the emergence of the United Public Workers, which was the final organization of all of this organized the Communist Party as it was never organized in the City of New York in the State of New York and in the United States of America and there was, as an old saying, that that particular local, Local 1 of New York City of the United Public Workers was known as the wonder local. They sent organizers all over the United States and the Panama Canal.

(At this point, Mr. Scherer withdrew from the hearing room.)

Mr. Rindone. They organized City, State, and Federal employees primarily for the purpose of establishing Communist

Party cells in the City, State, and Federal Government, and in the Panama Canal in which they were ousted at one point.

This was done by the United Public Workers of America, CIO, at that time, Local 1, starting in New York City, believe it or not.

That includes all of civil service, every walk of life, the laborers, the psychologists, the psychiatrists, anything you can think of, park employees, any kind of person that had anything to do with city, state, or federal government.

Mr. Tavenner. Of course, the United Public Workers of America was later expelled from the CIO because of Communist Party activity.

Mr. Rindone. That is right.

After I testified against its international president, they were ousted. I testified on January 10, 1951, and the Executive Board threw him out in February, 1951.

Mr. Kearney. But they are still in existence today?

Mr. Rindone. No, sir. They put the lock on the door.

Mr. Kearney. Who has taken over the United Public Workers of America?

Mr. Rindone. It is defunct, sir. However, they are in other aspects of our city, state, and federal government. For example, they are in Housing. You see, before I ever opened my mouth I had to make up my mind to one thing, that I had to level even if it meant the sacrifice of me not going to another position

which I couldn't possibly go to because they ask you questions and you have to answer them. I had to dedicate myself to being honest and exposing this with every ounce of my being.

Mr. Kearney. Whatever happened to Abram Flaxer?

Mr. Rindone. The last I heard one of the assistant supervisors told me, believe it or not, that he is some kind of an engineer in the construction field, because a building was going up and there was Abram Flaxer. Only recently the second Court of Appeals found him guilty for not turning over the names to a Senate committee.

By the way, that was one of the Supreme Court decisions which set aside his contempt of Congress case.

Mr. Tavenner. The case is now pending in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. It was set for argument in April but since the Supreme Court has agreed to review the Lloyd Barenblatt case, the arguments of Flaxer and other cases have been continued.

Mr. Kearney. There are several other cases pending on that decision.

Mr. Rindone. So that from Welfare, when they put the lock on the United Public Workers, I would like to give an explanation of how this happened, because if I don't you won't understand.

In 1948, before I read the article about Alexander Sacks in the World Telegram, I had decided that, well, there is no

sense in staying in the Welfare Department because it is a losing fight. So I arranged to get a transfer to the courts, which was all signed, sealed, and delivered. I was on vacation and saying my "good byes" to everybody until I met an individual who is now a member of the Appeals Division of the City Reclassification Board, Anthony Russo. I said, "I am leaving Welfare and being transferred to the courts, good bye," and he started a conversation, "What do you think of the idea of starting a right-wing United Public Workers organization?"

So my immediate reply was, "How many members do you have?"

He said, "Nobody but myself." The challenge was so great that I set the transfer to the courts aside and immediately started the organization of a right wing CIO organization. We were given refuge by the Utility Workers of America, the Consolidated Edison Employees Union, and from that day on until the time I testified in Washington at the CIO headquarters, the United Public Workers were stripped of their charter and ousted from the Welfare Department by order at that time of Commissioner Hilliard.

Now, where did they go from Welfare? From Welfare they started to go in the Housing Department. Mr. Jack Bigel, who was one of the people whom I knew as a Communist, was head of the United Public Workers locally, and Frankie Herbst moved into the Housing Authority. They sat there at the Housing Authority and they stacked the Housing Authority with all their

people. They had a big organization in Welfare. They had the run of the place. Now they had no home so they went into Housing and in Housing they started the usual thing.

You see, every one of these Housing developments, every one all over the United States of America, has a tenants organization which is run by the Communist Party.

Now, from my knowledge of the working of the Communist Party, each one of the Housing offices where people pay their rent, et cetera, has either a Communist Party cell or some Communist working in there, meeting on the side with the Communist members of the tenants organization, and telling them what to do and what not to do or what questions to raise when they come in for their grievances with the Housing people, and so forth and so on.

It was the same thing in the Department of Welfare. We used to have the workers aligning and poor people picketing out in the street for relief, and our Communist Party cell assigned a Communist from our cell to meet with the Communist representing the unemployed so that we could get together and tell them that "When you come into the office you bring ten people and when you see Comrade So and So, who is going to meet with you, you bang on the table and make a lot of noise and break a window or something, and disrupt the routine of the office," where people were seated in order to apply for relief, and through these pressures the Communist Party works the

same, not only in Welfare but in Housing, in the Federal courts, in the City courts, in the State courts, any place you could think of.

Mr. Tavenner. I want to know whether you are expressing it merely as an opinion.

Mr. Rindone. Knowledge and fact.

Mr. Tavenner. Or whether you have any factual information regarding the organization of Communist Party groups within tenant councils.

Mr. Rindone. Well, let me put it this way. I related to you that the office at which we all worked in this Communist Party cell had moved and the employees were dispersed to various other offices.

(At this point, Mr. Scherer entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Rindone. At that particular time -- God rest his soul -- former Governor Al Smith had gotten wind of the idea that each one of these Emergency Relief bureaus was issuing their own Communist Party publication. At that point it was around the year 1939. The Communist powers that be in the Welfare Department broke up the cells, the various cells which existed in the various offices and, as far as I was concerned, told me to report to a branch office in the neighborhood in which I lived.

This particular office, branch office of the Communist Party, was located in Williamsburg. At that time I recall I

was making \$21 a week in wages, and I had applied strictly on my own for one of the first applicants in the Public Housing development called the Williamsburg Houses. When I got to the branch of the Flatbush Communist Party, Flatbush Avenue Branch of the Communist Party, I met many people whom I did not know but, of course, I knew they were Communists because they were in a Communist branch. However, when I lived in the Williamsburg Houses, I was assigned to a Communist Party unit within the Williamsburg Houses.

Mr. Tavenner. That was part of the Public Housing of the City of New York?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir. I recall attending a Communist Party meeting at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Morris Gumpel. That was the Communist Party cell in the Williamsburg Houses. Mr. and Mrs. Gumpel were also members of a general tenants' association in the Williamsburg Houses. The Communists dominated this tenants organization by getting themselves elected as officers.

Although the organization, on the face of it, was not itself communist, it was run by the Communists, but the people that attended the meetings didn't realize that.

These meetings, I recall now, at Mr. and Mrs. Gumpel's house were attended by various persons who were members of the Communist Party but whom I did not know by name.

At these meetings usually the control of the tenants'

organization by the Communist Party was the chief topic of discussion.

I remember another meeting, it was on a Sunday, in the apartment of Mrs. Haberman. I recall attending this meeting and meeting a man whom I was introduced to as Mr. Heinz Norden. He represented himself as the Chairman of the Housing Commission of the Communist Party.

The discussion involved the Tenants Association and the continued control of that.

Mr. Tavenner. May I interrupt you a moment, there?

Mr. Rindone. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Did Mr. Norden also hold a position as an employee of the City of New York in connection with housing?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, I later found that out. It was the policy of the Williamsburg Houses housing office to send out a publication once a month relating news concerning the Williamsburg Houses and their employees.

In this publication, I saw where it said that Mr. Heinz Norden, a member of the New York City Housing Authority, has been inducted into the Navy. I am not sure of the title which he had in the Navy, but I thought it was an officer's title.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Chairman, I think I should let the record indicate here that our examination of the official records shows that this person by the name of Heinz Norden was Housing Manager within the New York City Housing Administration from 1941 to 1948.

This is the person who identified himself as the head of the Housing Commission of the Communist Party.

Now, let me interrupt you again. Do you know anything of a more recent date regarding Mr. Norden?

Mr. Rindone. No, very frankly I was shocked when I found out that he was a member of the New York City Housing Authority.

you
Mr. Tavenner. Will you give us the approximate date of the occurrence that you have just described?

Mr. Rindone. To the best of my ability I could date it all right, if I had some documents I have. However, it was around 1940.

Mr. Tavenner. Now let us go back to an earlier period.

Will you give us your experience in the Communist Party which would more fully cover the period that you first described when you were active, and the period of where Mr. Norden came on the scene and where you had an apartment at Williamsburg Houses.

Mr. Rindone. As I said, I was making \$21 a week, and I applied for the apartment, and got it on my merits, and when I got there I felt that we should have a social club made up of the tenants purely for social purposes. I did not intend it to have any political significance. I got a good medical plan started, ten cents a week, which was part of the organization, but after accomplishing this, I had a person visit me by the name of Bernard Kleban. I recall I was eating

my supper, and he knocked on the door, identified himself as being associated with the American Labor Party Club in the 13th Assembly District on Melrose Avenue in Brooklyn.

Now, he invited me to join this American Labor Party Club. I did so at the time and paid, I believe, one or two months' dues. However, immediately upon my entering the picture at the American Labor Party Club, I found myself voted in as the co-chairman of the whole club. It is difficult to prove that they knew that I was a Communist or for me to say that I have proof that they are Communists, but evidently they knew that I was a Communist as far as my own knowledge and conscience is concerned. Communism was never mentioned in this American Labor Party Club.

However, later Mr. Kleban ran for Congress on the American Labor Party ticket. I recall he ran against Dr. Pfeiffer.

Later this club was brought up on charges of communism by the Central ALP organization and the club house was closed.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you requested at any time to make contributions to the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. Oh, yes. I recall a peculiar incident in a way. I recall a peculiar incident that happened and I was kind of surprised. Of course, I now know that the Communist Party has various levels of organization like the first level, where all the sheep are, the second level where the intermediaries are, the third level where the top people are, and the top level where one person presses the button. I didn't know

know that and I will state that peculiarity to emphasize my point. I was employed at 208 East 23rd Street and I was approached one day by a person whom I had not known to be a member of the Communist Party because he wasn't assigned to the cell of the Communist Party to which I belonged. He approached me to sell me what they call an international fighting front stamp. The name of this person was Arthur Wells.

Mr. Tavenner. What official position did he have with the City Government?

Mr. Rindone. He was an investigator at that time. Then later he became an assistant supervisor.

Mr. Tavenner. Supervisor of what?

Mr. Rindone. A supervisor of a group of eight investigators.

Now, when he approached me to by this international fighting front stamp, the revenue, of course, from which was used for foreign communist causes all over the world, such as the civil war in Spain, I then realized that there was another level of communism in our particular office, not just the first level, the sheep that met at Communist Party meetings, as I did and some twenty others. The last time I saw Mr. Wells, I can't say that he was or wasn't a member of the Communist Party but anybody that sells international fighting front stamps to anybody, any logical mind or anybody that knows how the Communist Party works, must be a Communist Party member.

I understand that later I remember him visiting me at my

place of employment, and he was in some kind of a Naval officer's uniform. Then the last time I recall going to register to vote, I think it was around 1951, I met Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wells on the line, and he greeted me, et cetera, and I said, "What are you doing?"

He said, "I work for some motion picture organization."

That is the last I heard of Mr. Wells. His attitude wasn't too friendly. I don't know. There are many facets to this thing. Things happen that lots of us don't know about. Of course, he was kind of cold, and I just let it go at that.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not in your experience in the Communist Party you observed a plan of favoritism to those who were members of the Communist Party in the various departments of the City Government in which you worked?

Mr. Rindone. Well, there was no question about that in my mind. It is the most difficult thing to prove. Of my knowledge and experience it is a conspiracy, purely and simply. People are put in certain jobs by the Communist Party so that when the Communist Party presses the button they will do their bidding.

I will give you an example. The Department of Welfare at one time had some 8,000 or 10,000 employees. The Communist Party made it their business to have a personnel interviewer assigned to a particular job. If there was one red-blooded American in one of our offices who for some reason or other was brought

up to the main office for some disciplinary so-called charge, this personnel interviewer would be given the signal to press the button on this guy and down the chute he would go and out of the Department he would go, and that goes for assignments: assign So and So here, assign So and So there.

Mr. Kearney. Those were not Civil Service positions?

Mr. Rindone. Those are Civil Service positions of which I speak right now.

Mr. Kearney. Would they not have to be brought up on charges before they could be relieved of their civil service status?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, that is what the average citizen thinks.

You see, our Department of Welfare is made up mostly of social service employees, namely, social investigators, assistant supervisors, case supervisors, and administrators.

Now, something that the Communists set up is the fact that social case work is a question of interpretation. You could be the best social case worker in the world but yet if your supervisor, who reads those lines, is antagonistic toward you for any reason another interpretation could be put on it.

Mr. Kearney. Now, just a minute. Even though they were civil service employees?

Mr. Rindone. That is right. It is going on today.

Mr. Kearney. Well, I am simply now asking for information for myself. Under the Civil Service laws a man that is employed

in a civil service position has to be tried on charges before he can be fired, as I understand the law.

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir.

Mr. Kearney. Were these men tried?

Mr. Rindone. They are given the legal hearings, et cetera, and so forth. However, when a social investigator covers eighty families, for example, there is no human being alive that can possibly service eighty families continuously in every aspect, make all the collateral visits that are necessary, spend all the money that is necessary without --

Mr. Kearney. Let me interrupt again. I am not interested in whether he covers one or eighty families. What I am trying to arrive at is where was he tried, who tried him, what committee tried him, and did the Civil Service Commission know about these trials?

Mr. Rindone. Any social investigator who works for the Welfare Department is tried by the departmental hearing machinery.

The point that I was trying to make was this: If the Department of Welfare wants to pick on a particular person there on particular reason they can pull one or two of his cases and find thirty mistakes and make up a case on it and bring him up on charges that he did not service this particular case properly.

Mr. Kearney. Let me ask you this. In other words, compared to a trial, we will say, by a postal employee or by a civil government employee in any of the agencies in Washington, you are

telling us that the trial in your particular situation, Public Welfare, was more or less of a framed job and the strings were pulled by the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. That is right. I maintain that and I will give you an example of a person whose name is George Myers, who has come to see me since. He works for an insurance company. He flatly states that he was railroaded out of his job. Of course, his story is that he was asked to make a collection for the NAACP in the office and his views on that matter did not coincide with the views of the powers that be in the Communist Party in his particular office and he claims that they railroaded him, that they took him into a meeting and brought up various charges and told him, "The best thing for you to do is resign," and I am giving you his name, George Myers.

Mr. Kearney. Did the Civil Service Commission know about this way of trying individuals or having hearings for individuals who were Civil Service employees?

Mr. Rindone. Certainly the Civil Service Commission, the City Government, the Mayor knows all about these things.

Mr. Kearney. Then, in other words, what you are claiming is, if I get you right, that they are all in cahoots from the Mayor down?

Mr. Rindone. That is right. Let me explain this, sir, and I say this with every honest ounce of my being. When I was in

the Communist Party, you recall that there was the Wagner Act in Congress.

Mr. Kearney. Yes.

Mr. Rindone. As I said, they gave instructions to the Chairman to read to all the members that we were supposed to support the enactment of the Wagner Act because it would be another wedge for the Communist Party in their framework of activity for the future.

Now, I recall, and I will say this very carefully, that one of the members, Harry Solotarow, I believe it was, asked about Senator Wagner's son, "how about Bob, Junior," and I recall this very distinctly that the answer came from Sidney Goldring, who said that the Party was working on Bob, Jr., and I make that as a statement. I will tell that to the Mayor or the Commissioner.

Mr. Kearney. Let me understand. What do you mean when you say that the Party was working on Bob, Jr.?

Mr. Rindone. As I explained before, the Communist Party does not recruit any individual. They have a person assigned to work on that person to recruit him.

Now, when Bob, Jr., was in college, they would get one or two students to work on him, to become friends with him, to get mixed up in the things that he likes, not necessarily to make him a member of the Communist Party, and make him sign a card because there are many Communists who have not signed a card.

Nobody knows that they are members of the Communist Party but they would work on Bob, Jr., to change his frame of mind figuring in the future when he did become somebody -- they did this with everybody in important positions. If you have a son and you are in Congress, they will work on your son. They did it with my daughter in high school.

Mr. Kearney. You are not claiming that the present Mayor of New York, Mr. Wagner, is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. I didn't. I said that the Communist Party worked on him and indoctrinated him.

Mr. Kearney. I wanted to establish that for the record.

Mr. Rindone. I heard with my own ears and this is testimony that the Communist Party was working on Bob, Jr. That kind of discussion at a cell meeting in Communist parlance means that somebody is working on that person, namely, Bob Jr., to indoctrinate him.

Mr. Scherer. One form of brainwashing.

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir.

Mr. Kearney. All right. Proceed.

Mr. Scherer. And you say that procedure was followed on all politicians or the sons of prominent people in political life?

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir; in every school in the country. This is from my own knowledge that I gained in the Communist Party. They have Communist Party members. A cell can start with one member. It can start with two members. When the

Communist Party ~~wants~~ something done they just approach these people and these people go to work, for example, on somebody else. They will say, "We want you, for example, to work on Joe Kelly's son because Joe Kelly ten years from now will run for some political office." That young fellow is indoctrinated.

Mr. Scherer. But he does not know in many instances that he is the subject of Communist techniques?

Mr. Rindone. Exactly. I was sold a bill of goods. I thought it was a wonderful thing the way they explained it until I found out for myself.

But, you see, the Communist Party is an octopus. If you find out after a while that you have been indoctrinated and you are not doing the right thing and you want to get out they say, "Look, Mr. Kelly, if you make one move we will press a button and down the chute you will go."

Mr. Kearney. Now, do you still have the opinion that that is being continued in the present day?

Mr. Rindone. Sir, the Communist Party has cleansed itself of, I would say, dead wood, hangers on, et cetera, people of no consequence.

Mr. Kearney. In other words, it is a hard core.

Mr. Rindone. The Communist Party today is the experienced hard core made up of small cells.

I would like to relate this. I work as special officer.

I have a police booth. Six feet away from me is a fellow who the City Commission have investigated, has a file that thick on. We all know he is a Communist. We can't prove it.

Mr. Kearney. You men that is true today?

Mr. Rindone. That is today. They are a hard core. They hav control and they ain't going to give it up no matter how they put up on top.

Mr. Kearney. Well, as an employee of the City of New York, would you say today in your opinion that the New York City employees are permeated with members of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. No question. The Corporation Counsel's Office, the Comptroller's Office, Housing, Education. The teachers.

Mr. Kearney. That is fine, but you in the meantime have left the Party for a good many years.

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kearney. Now, how do you know that that situation exists today if you are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. Sir, when I was a member of the Communist Party from '36 up to about '41, I went to various social meetings and Communist Party meetings at the New York School of Music, at the Irving Plaza; the Manhattan Center, the various places, and I met people who were school teachers.

I remember one girl worked for a Protestant minister. She was telling me how wonderful she thought it was. I met all these people. I found out the workings first-hand.

Mr. Kearney. Again I am confused. That was when you were a member of the Communist Party. Now I am asking you: How do you know these things today if you are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Rindone. That is a good question, sir. You see, I have testified that I went to several fraction meetings. At one time I recall there was 150 people there and at another time there were over 200 people there. In working in the Department of Welfare all these years, the time that I spent in the Communist Party going to these meeting, I met all these people who have since come up to better positions, positions of policy.

Mr. Kearney. Have you given those names to counsel?

Mr. Rindone. I have given the names of all those people that I am sure of that I could recall that were members of the Communist Party. However, I have a reservoir of many hundreds of people whom I have met at various Communist Party functions over the years in which I was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Kearney. And they are employees of the City of New York today?

Mr. Rindone. Not all that I met but those that I do come in contact with I recognize.

Mr. Kearney. Some of them are employees of the City of New York today?

Mr. Rindone. Many of them, certainly.

Mr. Kearney. If you have not given those names to Counsel, I would suggest that later you do.

Mr. Rindone. Sir, hundreds of names is not easy to remember, you see.

Mr. Kearney. I am saying those names that you remember.

Mr. Rindone. We have fourteen different offices located throughout the five boroughs of the City of New York. I work in only one. For example, if I went to another office I couldn't tell you the name of the person working there but if I saw you, I could recognize you.

Mr. Kearney. All I am asking you to do is give what knowledge you have of your own. Never mind your other offices. If you have, for instance, we will take an arbitrary figure, thirty individuals on whom you have not yet given the names to counsel, some time later give them to the counsel.

Mr. Rindone. I can mention several here.

Mr. Tavenner. Let me suggest to you that you put into this record only those that you personally know are members of the Communist Party.

Mr. Kearney. That is right.

Mr. Tanner. Not persons that you think may be.

Mr. Rindone. That is right, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. I wanted you to be clear on that.

Mr. Rindone. Some of the people who I knew as Communists some of which I gave you and I won't repeat those, was Samuel

Sorkin, Harold Weinierde, Jack Bigel.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, just a moment. Go back to the first two that you mentioned. How were they employed in the City Government?

Mr. Rindone. Well, Samuel Sorkin was originally a social investigator. He eventually became the business manager of Local 1 of the subsequent United Public Workers of America. It was known by various other names before that.

Samuel Sorkin was at a meeting at the Stuyvesant Casino at which point his election came up as continuing business manager of this Local 1. The people were against him. I remember being at this fraction meeting. That is how I know Sam Sorkin. That is how I am identifying him as a Communist. You couldn't get into this meeting unless you showed your Communist Party book.

Mr. Kearney. What is your present position today? I have forgotten.

Mr. Rindone. My present position is special officer. I am deputized by the Police Department.

Mr. Kearney. Let me ask you this personal question. With all these things going on among the employees of the City of New York, the higher ups, what is going to happen to you after this testimony if it does become known?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I made up my mind about this in 1948 when I contacted the FBI on Alexander Sacks.

Mr. Kearney. How many years have you got in now?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I have twenty-three years.

Mr. Kearney. How old are you?

Mr. Rindone. I am forty-seven now. I have seven years to go.

Mr. Kearney. Well, to be very personal in my questioning, do you think in your own mind that when this testimony of yours becomes public you are going to be up on charges?

Mr. Rindone. I would be glad and willing.

Mr. Kearney. I know how you personally feel, but I am just asking you for the record, do you have any idea that you will be brought upon charges; on frame charges by those individuals? We will say that.

Mr. Rindone. They can't with me. I am not a social service worker. My work is not a question of interpretation. You see, I walk around with a police book. If I have a person approach me I keep writing name, time, date.

Mr. Kearney. But you are a Civil Service employees?

Mr. Rindone. That is right. They have tried that.

Mr. Kearney. That is what I am getting at. Do you have any fear that you might be brought up on charges as a civil service employee?

Mr. Rindone. Not because of my work, sir.

Mr. Kearney. I am not asking you because of your work. Are you fearful because of your testimony here? Let me

put it that way.

Mr. Rindone. In order to answer your question, the Communist Party has tried to oust me from the Welfare Department in many ways through many approaches both male and female. They have tried everything, my home phone and et cetera. They can't do it. They are afraid. The Commissioner, whoever he might be today or tomorrow, wouldn't do it because of my activity, the cooperation I have given to the Commissioner of Investigation, the Federal authorities and so forth, and the newspapers wouldn't stand for it. That is my opinion now.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can clear that up by asking one question.

Did you not testify in a City investigation which was being conducted here in 1955 and weren't you interrogated by the head of the Security Investigators for the City of New York?

Mr. Rindone. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. O'Connor?

Mr. Rindone. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. So the information that you are giving us here you have already given to City authorities in testimony?

Mr. Rindone. Many times.

Mr. Kearney. That is what I did not know and I wanted to bring that out as to whether in view of his previous testimony about all these civil service employees being brought up on

hearing charges he would be endangering his job.

Mr. Tavenner. I think I should state, too, for the record, Mr. Chairman, that a number of persons who are city employees have told the City Government of their own previous connection with the Communist Party and have given the facts and have not been molested in their jobs.

Is that correct?

*Reverend
p. 47*

STATEMENT OF JAMES J. MACKIN,
EXAMINER INSPECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INVESTIGATION,
CITY OF NEW YORK.

Mr. Mackin. I might add that it is the policy at the present time to discharge city employees where we find that they are of doubtful trust and value and subversive rather than discharging informants on them. That is the policy pursuant to Section 233 of the New York Security Risk law known as the Acts of 1951 as amended, and we have had several people either resign under fire or who were removed and in fact we have one conviction by the District Attorney of the Court of New York for one Welfare person, against whom this witness appeared as one of the witnesses, because of subversive activities, so that it is the present policy of the security officer of the City of New York, the Commissioner of Investigation, to compliment them.

Mr. Kearney. Anyone reading the record would be more or less confused by the testimony of the witness.

Mr. Mackin. The policy is to compliment them rather than persecute them.

Mr. Tavenner. I think there is only one other question that I wanted to ask you, unless you have not completed your statement, of persons known to you to have been members of the Communist Party back in the time that you attended what you call a fraction meeting of the Communist Party. You gave us one name and I do not know whether you had completed.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES RINDONE,
2120 - 33rd ROAD, LONG ISLAND 6,
NEW YORK - (Resumed)

Mr. Rindone. The last name I gave was Jack Bigel.

Mr. Tavenner. Let me ask you a question about him. Was he at any time employed by the City Government?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, he was employed as a social investigator in the City Government.

Mr. Tavenner. Was he also the head of the United Public Workers of America, that is, of your local chapter?

Mr. Rindone. He was the head of the district, as a matter of fact, which includes more or less the metropolitan area.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you happen to know whether or not he has been prominently identified with any union in which employees of the City Government would normally be members since the UPWA was kicked out of the CIO?

Mr. Rindone. Well, as far as I know Jack Bigel moved from the organization in Welfare to the Housing Authority and I understand that, to my knowledge and belief, he organized a number of housing authority employees, and I know of my own knowledge that, for example, the person I mentioned as a Communist, Harry Solotarow knew Jack Bigel very, very well.

Mr. Tavenner. Are there any others?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, I remember Ann Doliner and her brother, Henry Doliner. Then there was Selma Dubrin. I recall Mathilda Carman.

Mr. Tavenner. She was indicted for perjury in the course of the City investigation?

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir, she was convicted of perjury.

Mr. Tavenner. Her case is open on appeal.

Mr. Rindone. She was convicted of perjury on November 26, 1958, I believe. I know Danny Allen as a Communist. Michael Garramone. These are only some of the names I can recall.

Mr. Tavenner. Very well. I would like to ask you one more question.

Mr. Rindone. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. What were the circumstances which led to the termination of your Communist Party membership?

Mr. Rindone. Well, I could put it this way: On May 31, 1940, I was one of six hundred employees who was dismissed as provisional employees. They appealed to Communists. At that time the union was called The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, CIO. These six hundred employees appealed to the Communists to sue for reinstatement without result. I was later elected the chairman of this group. I collected \$2000 and commenced several actions, one of which I won in the Court of Appeals, Rindone v. Kern, which resulted in a competition examination, and the reinstatement of a good number of these employees. I myself was reinstated as a permanent employee in the capacity of payroll messenger in December of 1940.

I recall I was assigned to an office at 204 East 29th Street. There again I met Selma Dubrin, and other Communists in the Department. Dubrin was spokesman for the Communists and she and Alexander Sacks were contending for control of the office group, the Communist Party group that was. They took it for granted that I had continued my activity in the Party and they invited me to attend several meetings at the Stuyvesant Branch of the Communist Party, which was then located at 20 East 29th Street.

In conclusion, I would like to say this: In addition to me testifying against Abram Frazier of the United Public Workers which is now defunct which was one of the eleven pro-Communist unions which was thrown out of the CIO, I would like to reiterate the fact that there is still a hard core of Communist Party members in the Department of Welfare. I would estimate them to be from 200 to 300 Communists who actually run the Welfare Department.

I reiterate the other statement that I made that the hard core Communists can make or break almost any employee due to the fact that social case work is purely a matter of interpretation.

Mr. Tavenner. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kearney. The committee has none, but the committee does want to extend its appreciation to you for coming here today and giving the testimony that you have. It shows the revelation that is really shocking and what develops in the

the future will be the result of conference of the committee.

The committee thanks you.

Mr. Rindone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Nolan.

The witness is ready to be sworn.

Mr. Kearney. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Nolan. I do.

Mr. Tavenner. You are Mr. John Nolan?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN J. NOLAN,
1255 ADEE AVENUE, BRONX 69, NEW YORK.

Mr. Nolan. John J. Nolan, 1255 Adea Avenue, Bronx 69, New York; employed, New York City Housing Authority, Civil Service title, Foreman of Painters, duties, supervisor of field inspectors of painting.

Mr. Tavenner. How long have you been employed by the New York City Housing Authority?

Mr. Nolan. Since May, 1942.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Nolan, you have testified, I believe, before the City investigative group looking into the matter of Communist infiltration into various city departments, have you not?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. That testimony was based on your own experience at one time in the Communist Party, isn't that true?

Mr. Nolan. That is true.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell us, please, when you were in

the Communist Party; that is, when you went in and when you came out?

Mr. Nolan. Actual membership in the Party began a few months after I had left the service which would mean approximately March of 1946, and I would say to approximately the latter part of '47. In other words, that would break it down to about 19 or 20 months, or something like that.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party, and then later I will ask you the circumstances under which you left.

Mr. Nolan. All right. The circumstances under which I became a member of the Communist Party had been started back through a process of indoctrination and more or less accepting the ideas put forward by the Communist Party back to the years 1939 and so, by the time that I had started to work for the City Housing Authority in May, 1942, I was receptive to the ideas put forth by various Communists that I had come in contact with. At that time, 1942, I had seen in the union that I had joined, which represented employees in the City Housing Authority known then as the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, CIO, the leadership appeared to me at that time to be communist-dominated and as I say back in 1942, when I had joined the State, County and Municipal Workers, CIO, I recognized the fact that the leadership of the union was communist-

dominated and being previously indoctrinated over the period of three years prior to that by association with Communists I let it be known indirectly or directly that some of their ideas I agreed with so it was a question of remaining in that union approximately about six months and then entering the Navy from the year January, '43 to approximately November, '45, and coming out of the Navy I was disillusioned, disappointed with a lot of things in life, you might say.

Then I rejoined the State, County, and Municipal Workers and completely went over to joining the Party at that time.

In the State, County, and Municipal Workers, people in there just said, "Why don't you join the Party?"

Mr. Tavenner. Were you assigned to any particular group in the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. Nolan. Yes. I went into a branch of the Communist Party in the lower part of Manhattan. It was classified as an industrial type of branch of the Communist Party, which embraced the employees working in the City of New York.

Mr. Tavenner. What group of people generally were members of that cell of the Communist Party? I mean, what type of employment did they have?

Mr. Nolan. Yes. I would say in the main the employees were employees of the City of New York.

In my particular cell, the main category would be city employees working for the city of New York in various departments

of the City of New York, such as Housing Authority, Bureau president of Manhattan, Department of Parks, Department of Public Works, Health Department, Libraries, Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity.

Mr. Tavenner. Were all of these persons that were members of this Communist Party cell with you members of the same union?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. What union was that?

Mr. Nolan. Going back to 1946 when I first joined we, of that cell, of the Communist Party, were members in the Union of Local 111 of the State, County, and Municipal Workers.

Later in that year of 1946, that title of that union was changed to the United Public Workers, CIO.

Mr. Tavenner. Did the local retain its same number, 111?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, the local retained the same number, 111 of the United Public Workers. That is why I say it was an industrial branch of the Communist Party because every member in the cell belonged to that local 111 of that union and that local represented city workers and that union embraced State and Federal workers. That is, on a larger scale.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you a member of the same group of the Communist Party during your entire membership or were you transferred to a second group?

Mr. Nolan. No, I was in just that one group.

Mr. Tavenner. The one group?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, the names of the members of that group during your period of membership?

Mr. Nolan. Excuse me for a moment.

Mr. Kearney. Mr. Counsel, I would suggest that if the witness is going to start on this that we recess until 1:15 and then you will have a continuity to go right through without interruption.

We will recess until 1:15.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 1:15 p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Subcommittee reconvened at 1:15 p.m., pursuant to the recess.

Committee members present: Representatives Moran M. Moulder (Missouri) (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding, Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney (New York), Gordon H. Scherer (Ohio).

Mr. Moulder. The subcommittee will be in order.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this congressional subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. Blauvelt. I do.

Mr. Moulder. Would you state your name, residence, and occupation, please.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. MILDRED B. BLAUVELT,
DETECTIVE, BUREAU OF SPECIAL SERVICES,
POLICE DEPARTMENT, NEW YORK, NEW YORK.**

Mrs. Blauvelt. My name is Mildred B. Blauvelt. I am a detective with the New York City Police Department, assigned to the Bureau of Special Services.

Mr. Tavenner. You have testified at considerable length before this committee on another occasion, I believe.

Mrs. Blauvelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Tavenner. Mrs. Blauvelt, I have asked you to prepare a statement of matters within your knowledge concerning Communist Party interest and activities within the Housing Administra-

tion of the City of New York.

Have you prepared such a statement?

Mrs. Blauvelt. Yes, I have, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you have it with you?

Mrs. Blauvelt. I have it here.

Mr. Tavenner. You have shown the statement to me. Will you tell the committee, please, whether the statements contained therein are true and correct?

Mrs. Blauvelt. They are, sir. They are based upon my personal experiences within the Communist Party carrying out my assignment as an undercover operator within the Party upon the direction of the Police Department of New York City.

This statement contains the knowledge that I have gained as an undercover operative particularly pertaining to the activities of the Communist Party within housing projects. It contains my personal experiences and my own observations from such work.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Chairman, I see no practical value in having Mrs. Blauvelt read her statement into the record, and therefore I ask that it be introduced and incorporated into the record.

Mr. Moulder. The statement of the witness referred to by counsel will be incorporated into the record as the testimony of this witness.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Statement prepared by Det. Mildred V. Blauvelt, Bur. of Special Services, N.Y.C. Police Dept., for executive session of House Comm. on Un-American Activities, May 9, 1958.

- - -

Housing Projects, i.e., low-cost projects, are regarded as concentrations by the Communist Party.

According to communist definition, concentration is a Leninist method of work, i.e., Party activities are to be conducted in specified areas, such as working class areas, nationality groups, racial groups, etc., for the purpose of propagandizing the Party line.

A low-cost housing project, because of the socio-economic status or level of its tenants, fulfills the Party's requirements for a concentration. Here, in one designated area, the Party finds the low-income group, the working-class group, the racial groups or so-called minority groups, and those on relief, all of whom the communists hope to convince are being exploited and in whom they hope to nurture the seeds of dissatisfaction, so that they will turn to the Communist Party as the defender of human rights and the only organization, according to Party representations, interested in jobs, higher wages and equality for all. These are the people whom the communists hope to influence to carry the Party line to their shops, factories, union, social groups, even churches, by first reaching them in their homes with Party propaganda on the basic issues of their

daily living, on so-called civil rights issues, and on the issue of peace.

Party activity in housing projects is conducted through the technique of agit-prop, or agitational propaganda, which is the tactic of first educating the people how to think on a particular issue and then agitating them into taking specific action. This takes the form of the distribution of leaflets and the circulation of petitions on various issues of particular concern to the Party, especially the issue of peace; getting tenants to participate in delegations to Washington on the issues of rents, housing and price controls, and civil rights; holding demonstrations; canvassing with the Daily and Sunday Worker to establish paper routes and to secure subscriptions.

Party members, and especially those living in housing projects, are under directives to disseminate Party propaganda within the projects, one of the most effective ways being through the Tenants Councils which they organize and control. Although non-communists are sometimes placed in the leadership of these Tenants Councils for the sake of giving them an aura of respectability, the Party members are always on the executive committees, and they receive directives at Party meetings on issues to be projected at Tenant Council meetings. Tenants Councils are actually the sounding board for the Party line.

During my membership in the Communist Party as an undercover operative for the New York City Police Department, I

learned of the Party's aims to penetrate and infiltrate into housing projects, the methods used by the communists in their attempt to influence and gain support of the tenants around issues of interest to the Party, and actually participated in carrying out Party directives to make a concentration of a housing project.

One of the housing projects with which I became familiar because of my undercover work in the Communist Party was the Fort Greene Housing Project in Brooklyn. This Project had been what is called a Section in the organizational structure of the Party until it was merged with the Borough Hall Section in 1949. There were 60 members in the Project, divided into 3 clubs, the Fort Greene Club, the Frederick Douglass Club and the Walt Whitman Club. (Pg. 913 of previous testimony)

The Fort Green Project has a population of 2,000 to 3,000, and the number of 60 Party members may appear small. However, if we consider the number of Party members in proportion to the total population of Brooklyn, I think we will find that 60 Party members in the Fort Greene Housing Project is a fairly high percentage. For example, Brooklyn has a population of about 3,500,000. The Party, while I was in it, claimed a membership of 5,000 to 6,000 in Brooklyn alone, which would mean that the ratio was less than 2 communists out of every 1,000 population. A similar ratio for some 2,000 to 3,000 in the housing project would mean only about 5 communists in the project. Even if the

assumption that people of the socio-economic status living in housing projects are twice as prone to be communists as the people comprising the average population in the entire borough is made, that might give us 10 or 12 communists out of a population of 3,000. But certainly the number of 60 Party members out of the 3,000 persons in the Project is far out of line. It would appear that some factor other than normal percentage of population or susceptibility to communist recruitment would have to account for such a concentration of communists within one housing project. The conclusion that the factor involved is collusion with those who assign apartments in projects seems inescapable.

This Fort Greene Section of the Communist Party operated so openly that it held a rally on April 3, 1947, in the school located in the housing project for the purpose of protesting threats to outlaw the Communist Party. Al Neptune, one of the executive members of the Fort Greene Section, announced that this Section had raised \$1,400 toward the defense fund to be used by the Party to fight this threat. (Pg. 906 of previous testimony).

The Communist Party members in the Fort Greene Housing Project were also members of the Project's Tenants Council, and on several occasions when I was attending Section executive meetings held in the home of one of the Party members in the Project, the executive members of the tree clubs in the Project were excused from these meetings in order to attend meetings of

the Tenant Council.

At one such Party meeting which I attended, the question was raised as to whether or not the Fort Greene Tenants Council should conduct a Red Cross drive in the Project. The comrades were instructed that the Red Cross drive should not be conducted. The reason given was the propaganda line that the Red Cross segregated the blood of whites and non-whites. This propaganda line served a double purpose - one was to produce racial strife and resentment, while the other purpose was to discredit the Red Cross and make it ineffectual. Knowing the long-range planning of objectives that goes into all communist activities, I feel that the tension that existed in Korea at that time and which resulted in the outbreak of hostilities a few months later was a motivating reason behind this expressed policy. How different it was during World War II when the Soviet was on the side of the United States fighting Hitler! At that time the Communist Party openly conducted campaigns for the Red Cross and urged all to donate blood so that our soldiers might be well supplied with blood to save their lives.

My undercover work in the Communist Party brought me into direct participation in Party activities in the Gowanus Housing Project. In March of 1950 the club of which I was a member, the Jay-Smith Club, was directed to make the Gowanus Housing Project its concentration for Party activities, and the members were to canvass with the Daily and Sunday Workers, and were

to conduct leaflet distributions in the Project. (Pg 392 of previous testimony)

Seven members of the Jay-Smith Club were tenants in the Gowanus Housing Project, and while all were required to be members of the Tenants Council in the Project, two had the specific assignment of being on the executive board of the Council so that they could attend executive meetings and be in a position to direct its policy. Laura Fields was the Secretary of the Council, and inasmuch as she was well versed in Marxist theory, had the task of writing the Council's newspaper so that it had the correct Marxist slant. Nettie Feuer was the Vice-President of the Council, and inasmuch as she was a comparatively new tenant in the Project and had not yet been exposed by word or deed to any suspicion of communist leanings, it became necessary to keep her above suspicion so that whenever the Party wanted a particular activity projected in the Tenants Council, she could do so and no one would suspect its motivations. Ann Bryant, who could not openly participate in Party activities because she was awaiting naturalization and could not jeopardize it, was ordered by the Party to be active in the Tenants Council in furtherance of Party directives. At Party meetings, these comrades would be instructed as to what they should do at the next meeting of the Tenants Council, and when it was felt they were not working effectively, they were criticized and reminded how they were to carry out Party directives.

Party directives to make the Gowanus Housing Project a concentration were strictly adhered to in connection with the Party's spurious campaign for peace. In 1950 when the Party launched its intensive drive based on the circulation of the Stockholm Peace Petition, the Jay-Smith Club faithfully followed orders to flood the housing project with leaflets on peace, and mobilized the membership to canvass every building in the project to secure signatures to the Stockholm Peace Petition. So important was this drive considered that three top-level functionaries of the Brooklyn C. P., namely, Cari Vedro, then the Chairman of the Brooklyn Party; Ben Davis, then the Regional Director of the Waterfront Region; and Margaret Krumbein, Director of the highly selective training cadres conducted by the Party, participated in canvassing the Gowanus Housing Project with the Stockholm Peace Petition. (Pgs. 951-955 in previous testimony)

In 1951 when the communist-front organization for peace, the American Peace Crusade, was launched, right in the midst of the Korean War, the same procedure was followed. The Party members canvassed the Project with peace ballots on the question of bringing our troops back from Korea and for making peace with China, and distributed reprints of a Daily Worker editorial on MacArthur's recall from his command in the Far East, the Korean War, and peace. Concerted canvassing was conducted in the Project to see if any of the tenants could be persuaded to attend the American Peace Crusade's conference for peace to be held in

Chicago from June 29 to July 1, 1951, as delegates from the housing project, and the Party members in the Tenants Council had the task of trying to get a member of the Council to attend this peace conference as a delegate of the Gowanus Tenants Council. In addition, the Party members were ordered to see that peace committees were established among the tenants in the various buildings of the Project, and the comrades in the Tenants Council were constantly ordered to project Party propaganda on peace at executive and membership meetings of the Council, relating the need for peace to the basic issues of jobs, wages, prices, etc. (Pgs. 957-960 of previous testimony)

The ultimate purpose of all of this activity was to recruit the tenants into the C.P., but if that could not be accomplished, the very least the communists hoped to do was to gain support for Party propaganda. The sheer weight of numbers supporting any propaganda campaign, either in the name of the Party, but more usually in the name of a front organization, might give the impression that it was the actual will of the people, and thus serve the Party in projecting its own aims.

I learned also that the housing project in the Red Hook section was considered important to the Party. I personally knew two of the Party members living in the Red Hook Housing Project, one Blanche Spindell, and the other known only to me as Moishe, who, along with myself, had been especially selected to attend a training cadre conducted by the County Committee of the Brooklyn

C.P. under the direction of Margaret Krumbein, whom I consider one of the most dangerous members of the C.P. because of her job to train potential leaders in the Party.

The Red Hook Housing Project was made the center of a demonstration held by the C.P. in its unceasing activity in behalf of Willie McGee, a southern Negro who had received a death sentence for rape. Execution was scheduled for May 8, 1951, and on the evening before, the Party conducted an all-night vigil on the mall of the Red Hook Housing Project demanding a stay of execution. The Party members were notified to participate in the vigil, as well as to call the CBS broadcasting station to demand that the Willie McGee case be included in their news broadcasts in order that this case might be brought to the attention of the people of New York. By this type of activity the Party hoped to whip up racial antagonisms, and draw racial groups closer to the Party by representing itself as the defender of human and civil rights, and as the fighter for justice for the downtrodden.

I believe it was in 1955 that the tenants of the Williamsburg Housing Project became involved in a fight against an act which would have required tenants of housing projects to sign a loyalty oath. This fight was led by a Rebeka Peters. It may be coincidence, but when I attended a Women's Conference for Peace held by the Brooklyn C.P. on May 26, 1951, one of the speakers was introduced as Beckie Peters of Williamsburg.

I knew two members of the LaPassionara Club, the Party's Puerto Rican club in the Borough Hall Section, who were tenants in the Kingsboro Housing Project. It was their particular task to work among the Puerto Ricans to recruit them into the Party.

In view of what I consider the large number of communists living in housing projects, I have often posed the following questions: Is it not significant that so many of them have gotten into the projects? Was there collusion? Were they all taken in chronological order of application? In connection with that particular question I am thinking of Irving and Nettie Feuer who moved from the Bronx to the Gowanus Housing Project in Brooklyn. It was, by the way, in their apartment that the meeting at which I was expelled from the Party was held. Another question I have posed is why no check was made of their loyalty. It seems to me that it is an imposition upon the American taxpayers that they must subsidize the rents of people who are trying to destroy the American way of life, and I feel that loyalty oaths should be required of the tenants in federal-subsidized housing projects.

The Communist Party views housing projects as a fertile field for the dissemination of its propaganda and for the eventual recruitment of the tenants into the Party. The projects serve as a means of concentrating people into one area so that the communists can work more easily and readily among them

with a greater opportunity for success than if these same people were dispersed over a large area. They therefore serve the Party well.

Mr. Moulder. We do want to express to you our gratitude
and thanks for your cooperation.

Mrs. Blauvelt. Thank you, Mr. Moulder.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN J. NOLAN,
1255 ADEE AVENUE, BRONX 69,
NEW YORK - (Resumed)

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Nolan, as we were about to adjourn for the noon recess, I asked you to give us the names of persons who were members of the same Communist Party group with you during the period from 1947 to 1948, in the City of New York.

Mr. Nolan. May I say '47 instead of '48? I am not too sure of '48.

Mr. Tavenner. Yes, I am reasonably certain you said 1947.

Mr. Nolan. In reference to the names of those people in attendance at meetings in which I attended, closed party meetings of the Communist Party, to the best of my knowledge and remembrance, these people are as follows: --

Mr. Tavenner. May I interrupt you? In giving the name of an individual, will you give as much descriptive information about them as you can, including the position that they held in the City Government if so employed and what your last knowledge of their employment is.

Mr. Nolan. All right. One, Jack Bigel. When I refer I will have to say Jack Bigel at the time that he was a member of the Communist Party was the district representative of the United Public Workers, employed that is, as a district representative of the United Public Workers, the New York District Representative.

Mr. Tavenner. Therefore, he was not at that time actually

employed by the City of New York?

Mr. Nolan. No, sir. He had been formerly employed by the Department of Welfare, City of New York. I understand that after that, after I left the Party he maintained his employment into Local 237 of the Brotherhood of Teamsters. I will try to bring this out as briefly as I can. In other words, they disbanded the United Public Workers and Local 237 merely got under the wing or got a charter from the Brotherhood of Teamsters and he was the paid agent for 237 as far as I know, Local 237.

Mr. Tavenner. Were city employees members of 237 the same as they had been members of United Public Workers of America?

Mr. Nolan. That is correct. It was the same setup except with different labels on it all the way through from the time I first became acquainted with it in 1942 right up to the time I left it; and right up until maybe a year or so ago that I kept track of it it was still the same civil service employees belonging to the union except they had different labels going from State, County, and Municipal Workers to United Public Workers to Local 237 of the Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Mr. Tavenner. Can you give us the names of any other officials of those unions who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party in addition to Bigel?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, I can, but if there is no objection on your part, I would rather either deal with the members of my cell first and then go into those others, or to take them in terms of the

union leadership first and then branch out into the members of the cell.

Mr. Tavenner. Just go ahead as you started.

Mr. Nolan. Jack Bigel, as I say -- I gave a description of him -- was employed by this union. In my opinion, he gave the orders.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you mean gave orders to the union or gave orders to Communist Party members?

Mr. Nolan. I say he gave orders in the union and he gave orders in the Communist Party of my cell.

The second one would be Abraham Ginsberg. This is the second one in my cell. Abraham Ginsberg worked or was employed in the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity, I believe in the capacity of an engineer. Also he had been a member of Local 111 of the United Public Workers.

Two, Harold Fink, member of my cell, Communist Party cell that is, employed by the Department of Public Works as chief engineer of the Department of Public Works and also a member of Local 111 of the United Public Workers; also a member of Local 111 United Public Workers.

In the last two names of Ginsberg and Fink, I would classify them as very active members in Local 111 of the United Public Workers.

Lewis Sklar was a professional man, either an engineer or draftsman, or something of that sort. He was a member of the

cell and also a member of the United Public Workers and an active one of Local 111, United Public Workers.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell me whether those persons that you have named are still employed by the City Government or how recently they have been employed?

Mr. Nolan. All right, sir. From the information that I know of by reading through newspapers, Mr. Ginsberg, I understand, was allowed to retire on a disability pension.

Mr. Fink resigned under fire.

Mr. Sklar resigned under fire.

Mr. Tavenner. During what year was that?

Mr. Nolan. That they resigned?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes.

Mr. Nolan. I would more or less say that would run back about two years or somewhere. I don't remember that particularly. I would have to recollect my memory to newspaper articles and things like that.

Mr. Tavenner. Approximately two years?

Mr. Nolan. Approximately two years.

Samuel Garnett was, I believe, an engineer in the Department of Public Works, employed by the City of New York, a member of my cell, also a member of Local 111 of United Public Workers and at one time president of Local 111 of the United Public Workers, and he also resigned under fire.

Mr. Tavenner. Was that about the same time as the others?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, yes. There might have been a month or so in between them but they more or less all resigned around the same time.

Manny Sherman was employed by the Department of Health in a professional category. I don't know if he was a bacteriologist or some other title in civil service, a member of my cell, also a member of local 111 of the United Public Workers and at one time the paid organizer for Local 111 on a leave of absence. He was on a leave of absence from the City of New York and was paid by Local 111 of the United Public Workers.

Anna Thau was a provisional employee, housing assistant in the New York City Housing Authority, was a member of the cell and also a member of Local 111 of the United Public Workers, was laid off by the City Housing Authority due to the fact that a civil service list had come into existence and she was not on that list. I don't know the whereabouts of her present employ or what has happened to her.

Charles Rutkoff was a civil service examiner in the then known as the Civil Service Commission, now known as the Department of Personnel, City of New York. He was a member of my cell and also a member of Local 111, United Public Workers, and an active one.

Mr. Tavenner. May I interrupt you a moment? What is the basis of your statement that they were members of your cell?

Mr. Nolan. Members of the Communist Party cell.

Mr. Tavenner. How do you know that?

Mr. Nolan. I attended meetings with them.

Mr. Tavenner. More than one meeting?

Mr. Nolan. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Did each of those persons that you named attend a number of meetings?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, they attended one or more meetings. Some individuals might have attended more but in my presence it varied. Some might have attended five in my presence. Some might have attended two and some might have even went to ten. It varied. I couldn't say the same thing held true for all of them.

Mr. Tavenner. Excuse me. Go ahead.

Mr. Nolan. Eimer Luepke. I am not too sure of the spelling. I believe it is L-u-e-p-k-e. He is a professional employee, I believe a draftsman, in the Department of Public Works, a member of the Communist Party cell to which I belonged and a member of Local 111, United Public Workers. He had been a Chief Petty Officer in the United States Navy during World War II. He resigned under fire. Incidentally, going back to Rutkoff, he also resigned under fire about the same time as the rest. This person that I recall to the best of my knowledge, that is the name that I remember knowing her by was Shirley Tucker. She had worked in libraries, I believe the Branch of Libraries was on 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, at that time that is, but these librarians

moved about quite frequently. They didn't seem to stay put in one branch particularly.

As I say, to the best of my knowledge, I knew her as Shirley Tucker. She was a member of the Communist Party cell I belonged to and also a member of the United Public Workers Local 111. I don't know whatever happened to her, whether she remained a city employee, whether she resigned. I just don't know anything about her, to be very honest with you.

Gerard F. Jansen was a former painter, New York City Housing Authority, and a member of the Communist Party cell that I belonged to, and also a member of Local 111, a very active worker in Local 111. He also resigned under fire.

Larry Borgia. I don't know the correct spelling of that. It may be B-o-r-g-i-a or it maybe B-o-r-g-e-i. He had been employed at that time by the Department of Parks as a gardener or an assistant gardener. I don't know his correct title but I know he had been a college man. I believe it was the University of Rochester that he had been going to or had been to and he had, as I said, been employed by the Department of Parks, had been a member of the Communist Party, belonged to and also an active worker in the Local 111 of the United Public Workers. Again, I don't know what happened to this Mr. Borgia, whether he just quit the city employ and is now in private industry or where he is.

Edward Beer. I guess you could spell it like a glass of beer

if you wanted to. He is employed in the Municipal Court of the City of New York as a clerk or some such title. He was a member of the cell of the Communist Party I belonged to and also a member of the Local 111, United Public Workers.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you know whether he is still employed there?

Mr. Nolan. I believe he is. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Let me ask you another question about Mr. Jansen. I believe you said he was active in the union, a very active member, you said.

Mr. Nolan. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Was he active in the Communist Party cell?

Mr. Nolan. He was not at that time that I belonged to the cell a very active member in the Communist Party in terms of attending meetings only but actually we ~~but~~ that cell discussed Communist Party business and generally carried forward or tried to carry forward to whatever decisions we reached back into the union and it was like part and parcel of the whole setup so all he needed was an order from Jack Bigel and, no matter what the order was, he would do it, so he didn't have to actually attend Communist Party meetings to carry through the business of the Communist Party. He just missed on that one point of attending Communist Party meetings, but, as far as carrying out the work for the Party/^{he} was very active in doing that within the union itself.

Mr. Tavenner. Did he at any time act as chairman of the

Communist Party meetings?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, he acted as chairman of the Communist Party meetings, at one time that I recall in particular.

Mr. Tavenner. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. Nolan. That is about the only ones I can think of at the present time that would have been a member of that cell that I belonged to. There were others but I couldn't recall their names.

Mr. Tavenner. Can you give us an idea how many persons were members of that cell? What was the gross number over the period from '46 to '47?

Mr. Nolan. Well, I couldn't go in terms of what was on the books. I would have to go in terms of what I actually saw, because I never saw the books, but I could say that there was at least 25 members in that cell.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, that cell was confined to what general area?

Mr. Nolan. That cell was confined to Local 111 of the United Public Workers. The area covered the entire city of New York because, as I stated before, it was an industrial branch of the Communist Party, and an industrial branch of the Communist Party is a branch where certain employees are in a certain industry just like if they were automobile workers, for example, they would be in the automobile industry, and if they wanted to set up an industrial branch among the automobile employees, they

would set up that type of branch.

In our case, it was civil service employees.

Mr. Scherer. How many members did that Local have approximately? You said there were about 25.

Mr. Nolan. No, that is where it gets confusing. I said there was 25 members of the Communist Party cell.

Mr. Scherer. That is right.

Mr. Nolan. Of the local of the union was something else. That was much larger. That could run anywhere through one thousand, 1100, 1200.

Mr. Scherer. That is members in the union?

Mr. Nolan. In the union.

Mr. Scherer. But only about 25 of those members were Communists?

Mr. Nolan. That I know were present at meetings. There could have been more.

Mr. Scherer. That is right.

Mr. Tavenner. Were there, to your knowledge, other groups or cells of the Communist Party made up of members of that union?

Mr. Nolan. Oh, yes. There was Local 1, which was a welfare local. They had a cell of the Communist Party where those people were also members of Local 1 of the United Public Workers but I have never attended the Communist cell that belonged to Local 1.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, the number of cells of the Communist Party that existed to which

City Government employees were expected to be members? How many cells altogether do you think there were?

Mr. Nolan. Well, I really couldn't answer you on that.

Mr. Tavenner. How many do you know of?

Mr. Nolan. Well, as I say, I know that the Local 111 embraced approximately fourteen city departments. That was one cell. I knew there was Welfare. That was another cell. That is all I know of. There was a State but I didn't know too much about it.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, what appeared to you to be the purposes or objectives of this cell of the Communist Party of which you were a member?

Mr. Nolan. Well, it was not what it appeared. What it was is it was a cell of the Communist Party whose aims and purposes were to advance and build the United Public Workers and in turn get back into, through the United Public Workers, prospective members to belong to the Communist Party. By fighting for certain issues, say, for example, through the union, you became a sort of champion for certain rights and you automatically had certain people that were interested in you and interested in what you fought for and, as a result of that, if you spotted someone that was a little receptive to some ideas you had a prospect that you could encourage to belong to the Communist Party.

And also I forgot this part. In the Communist cell in carrying forth, it wasn't just to build up Local 111 and thereby get

people to bring them into the Communist Party. You also were carrying out the directives of the Communist Party in through that union, or that union. For example, if we wanted to push a campaign against this committee, for example, the House Un-American Activities Committee, we would go back to the union and go like the hammers of hell to get all kinds of postcard and petitions so that these people would be calling you names even in their own minds, besides writing petitions and postcards, et cetera. Whatever the Party felt was a directive to the cell, and then, of course, they gave other orders to other cells and we would be back through the membership of the union and get certain petitions signed and certain postcards pushed.

Mr. Scherer. Was not one of the techniques to charge this committee with union-busting among the rank and file? That would incite the general membership who were not Communists to oppose the committee, would it not?

Mr. Nolan. That is correct. It was antitactic. Well, to put it more bluntly, if you will tell somebody that you put attitude on another person, he is a "Nazi," and right away you have certain people receptive to you because they don't like Nazis.

By the same token, if somebody thought you were against labor, they would sign anything if they were told that you were against labor.

That was the tactic and strategy, too.

(At this point, Mr. Kearney left the hearing room.)

Mr. Tavenner. Were you assigned any particular activity in the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. In the Communist Party, I wouldn't say particularly any activity. I might have chaired a meeting. I might have conducted a class in trade unionism in the union.

Mr. Tavenner. Then you were assigned special duties in the union?

Mr. Nolan. Oh, definitely.

Mr. Tavenner. This Local 111?

Mr. Nolan. Right.

Mr. Tavenner. Who assigned the duties to you and what were they?

Mr. Nolan. Well, for example, I was Wage Increase Chairman of Local 111 one year, I believe it was 1946, to be exact, and that meant getting literature out to the various job stewards, also getting members of Local 111 to demonstrate in coordination with the district. We might have a parade up Broadway. We might have a demonstration in front of City Hall. That was one item.

(At this point, Mr. Kearney entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Nolan. Another item was at one time to organize and put into practice a class for trade unionism for sanitation workers. That was an assignment given to me by Jim King. He was then the District Representative of the United Public Workers. He said that they have these sanitation workers which were another

local, and that they should be given a class in unionism and he wanted me to take an assignment and then I had to line up speakers or lecturers or whatever you want to call them.

Mr. Tavenner. Who did you select as the lecturers on trade unionism?

Mr. Nolan. Well, I selected for one, Jack Bigel.

Mr. Tavenner. He was one of the leading Communists of the area?

Mr. Nolan. Ewart Guinir.

Mr. Tavenner. Have you mentioned him before?

Mr. Nolan. No, I have not.

Mr. Tavenner. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. Known to me in verbal exchanges. He never was a member of my cell that I knew of. At least, I never seen him in attendance at my cell.

Mr. Tavenner. Was this verbal exchange between you and Guinir?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir. I mean there were a lot of Communist you met in your travels even within the union itself that told you they were Communists and you told them. You didn't exchange identification cards because you didn't carry cards with you. You knew the line so you were outspoken with one another.

Mr. Tavenner. You selected those two?

Mr. Nolan. Ewart Guinir was at one time the district

representative of the United Public Workers also and he had been previously employed, that is, prior to his employment by the United Public Workers, he had been employed as a civil service examiner in the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Tavenner. Of the City of New York?

Mr. Nolan. Of the City of New York. He resigned the position of Civil Service Examiner under fire and joined the Army and was a Warrant Officer during World War II, and then came to the employ of the United Public Workers.

Mr. Tavenner. What do you mean by "resigned under fire"?

Mr. Nolan. He was questioned as to some of his activities, you might say.

Mr. Tavenner. Well, did that questioning have anything to do with communism?

Mr. Nolan. That I couldn't tell you.

Mr. Tavenner. I see.

Mr. Nolan. That I couldn't tell you. That would be the information in the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Tavenner. Were there any others that you can recall that you selected to assist in this trade unionism class?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, there was Jim King. Jim King also had given the same class as Ewart Guinir, verbal exchanges in relationship to being a communist. He also had been a district representative of United Public Workers and he had been a speaker at one of these classes.

As I said previously, Jim King was the one that asked me to conduct the class as a party assignment.

Mr. Tavenner. As a Communist Party assignment?

Mr. Nolan. As a Communist Party assignment and also an assignment of the union.

Mr. Tavenner. Well, that ties it together.

What was the nature of the conversation that you had with Mr. King which led you to believe that he was a member of the Communist Party? You said it was by verbal exchange.

Mr. Nolan. Well, it is rather difficult to pinpoint and say how did it get started, but it amounts to this: Jim King being a district representative of the United Public Workers was naturally interested in who was in what position in the union and if he wanted to ask about any member of that union as to his sympathies toward the Communist Party or if he was a member of the Communist Party he found that out very easily, so all he had to do was ask anyone in my cell if he was O.K. and then he would just come up and say, "You know, I'm in the Party like you," and by the same token those people in my cell would tell me that Jim King was a Party member also.

Mr. Tavenner. Did you have a conversation with him at any time regarding work that was being done in support of a Catholic slate in the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists?

Mr. Nolan. Yes. The incident I recall was this: Within the union itself, the United Public Workers, there had been

forming opposition. Opposition had been under the leadership of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. They wanted to bust this leadership, the present leadership that was in power at the time of the United Public Workers. They wanted to bust it and therefore they put up a slate of officers to oppose the officers being put up by the local.

That is where Jim King had come along and mentioned to me and said to me, "You know Steve Gorey and the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists are trying to throw us out and so for the party's sake, we have got to stop them. We can't lose control of this union."

In other words, it was an actual battle on principles more so than a battle of losing, say, an elected office.

If the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists had got hold of certain positions in this union they would probably have busted it up, but they were defeated in the election.

Mr. Tavenner. Tell us, please, what was the date when you were assigned to this task of developing the trade unionism class.

Mr. Nolan. That would be hard to say. I'd say it was somewhere in 1946. I couldn't really pinpoint it after all these years now and after so much testimony, pinpoint it right down to a given month and a given year.

I would say approximately the latter part of '46.

Mr. Tavenner. Was there any period prior to 1947 when

you were temporarily unemployed in your employment?

Mr. Nolan. No, not in '47.

Mr. Tavenner. Was there any time prior to that that you were temporarily off the job?

Mr. Nolan. To '47?

Mr. Tavenner. Prior to '47.

Mr. Nolan. No, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. You mentioned Mr. Fink early in your testimony. What part did Fink play in conduct of the Communist Party cell meetings or the business of the Communist Party generally?

Mr. Nolan. Well, Harold Fink attended quite a few meetings. He always took part in the discussion of the meeting and was active. I mean he was outspoken in his feelings, expressing his opinions and feelings toward his devotion to the Communist Party. He seemed to be guided by what he believed in in the Communist Party. Everything seemed to be for the Party; the Party has to survive, and in the union we may have to be a little cautious at times on a certain issue so as not to betray our identity.

Mr. Tavenner. What do you mean by that, be cautious not to betray your identity? What do you mean by that?

Mr. Nolan. Betray our identity as Communists. In other words, within the union we would portray ourselves as representatives of the union but in effect we would be trying to

achieve something for the Communist Party.

Our whole principle and convictions were based on, first, as Communists, and second, as union member. I mean if we had a choice we would take communism first.

Mr. Tavenner. Did you have any personal knowledge of the existence of neighborhood groups of the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. Personal knowledge of neighborhood groups only in the sense of what I was told.

Mr. Tavenner. You knew there were such groups?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, they were all over the city.

Mr. Tavenner. Well, do you know whether or not city employees were also members of those neighborhood groups?

Mr. Nolan. Yes. I will tell you what I would like to do first, if I may. There was one other person that was very important in the United Public Workers. Correcting that, I might have to say very important in the State, County, and Municipal Workers. His name was Danny Ireland.

After coming out of the Army, where I believe he was in some branch concerning research on weather conditions, he had left the State, County, and Municipal Workers to take charge of the city CIO political action committee. Spelling that out, it means that the CIO, the parent body organization at the time had a political action committee going nationally and he happened to be the head of it locally in the city of New York.

He left the State, County and Municipal Workers to become

employed by the Political Action Committee for the City of New York.

Now, getting back to the question of people in neighborhood branches, I do this on this basis: that I must say that I could not swear that I had been in attendance with any of these people at Communist Party meetings but through exchanged again they admitted membership in the Communist Party to me.

Mr. Tavenner. You mean they verbally admitted to you membership?

Mr. Nolan. In the Communist Party.

Mr. Kearney. Pardon me for interrupting. Let me ask you this question.

Was it usual for members of one cell of the Communist Party to know who the members of another cell were or was that kept secret?

Mr. Nolan. No, In the year I am speaking of, '46, which was right after World War II, the security measures of the Communist Party were not too strong. They had not attempted to go underground at that time as far as the general over-all rank and file of the Communist Party was concerned but as far as identifying yourself with another Communist, once you recognized or had suspicion of another person being a Communist you generally made inquiries or by searching out through conversation and the first thing you know you arrived at "Well, I'm a member of this cell," and he or she would say, "I am a member

of another cell," and you became buddies-buddies so to speak, but today I imagine that would be difficult to establish. Once you were in conversation and through conversation started to expound the Party line it was easy to recognize another Communist. If it was a non-Communist they would give you a little opposition or they would throw certain roadblocks in front of you.

Mr. Kearney. The reason I asked that question is that I think it is on our record of testimony here in previous months gone by that witnesses have testified that since the security measures have been put into effect more than they were generally following World War II that the membership of one communist cell would not know what the membership of another communist cell was.

Mr. Nolan. Prior?

Mr. Kearney. No, after the war.

Mr. Nolan. After the war it was loose in that sense.

Mr. Kearney. Yes, but then it became strict and tighter.

Mr. Nolan. Tight, that is right. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, did you have any particular assignment by the Communist Party that would place a duty upon you to make inquiry as to membership?

Mr. Nolan. Yes. At one meeting we had been discussing it more or less. It more or less was a directive from the section of the Communist Party to try to get members who were

in the union, who were also members of the Communist Party, through again exchanges that we knew to be members of the Communist Party and try to convince them to take a transfer over into the industrial branch.

Mr. Tavenner. Transfer from what?

Mr. Nolan. From whatever branch they were in.

Well, I don't know if I am confusing you or not, but, as I said, we were a cell. That cell was composed of city employees who were members of Local 111 of the United Public Workers. We had to do a job in that local. We, as Communists, had to do a job, so we wanted to get those people who were members of that local who we felt were Communists and get them to transfer from whatever branch they were in, and in most cases they were members of neighborhood branches, neighborhood branches only in the sense of the neighborhood they lived in, not in the sense of the neighborhood where we were meeting.

Getting back to what I had stated before in reference to our cell, as a directive from the section of the Communist Party to us that we should try to encourage those people that we knew to be Communists to take this transfer so that we could get that many more active Communists into the union and be active in the union and then that would build up the Communist Party eventually, in other words, make the union stronger and have more of an arm to spread out. In that case there were certain people that I knew to be members of the Communist Party

whom I approached and one of them was Sara Dolgin.

Mr. Tavenner. Spell that name.

Mr. Nolan. D-o-l-g-i-n, I believe. I can't give it to you exactly. She was the manager in the New York City Housing Authority at the present time. At that time when I approved her to take a transfer into my cell she was a Housing Assistant employed in the New York City Housing Authority. She didn't want to take the transfer. She admitted membership in the Communist Party and naturally I am selling her the point to transfer into my cell and she just didn't want to hear of it because she felt that she was doing better work for the Communist Party in her neighborhood branch where she lived. It was somewhere in the lower part of Brooklyn or the downtown section of Brooklyn. Therefore she couldn't see any point to transferring over to this industrial type of branch but she would be willing to carry out any directives within the union that we felt we wanted to pass on to her.

If we said, "Well, we are going to push the petitions" for this or that and she would go out and she would do her job just like everybody else but a little better than the average union member.

There had been another person, Sylvia Berg, as I always have known her as. I understand she has a marriage name of Abrams. She at that time was a housing assistant also in the New York City Housing Authority, and today is a manager of the

New York City Housing Authority. I also approached her after naturally exchanging identities as being members of the Party, about transferring over into the industrial branch of the Communist Party and she had these same reasons that she had been active in her neighborhood branch in the Chelsea section of Manhattan and therefore she wasn't going to come into our cell or branch, she was going to stay in the neighborhood branch where she had been doing good work and she had made a lot of contacts in the neighborhood, and so forth.

Mr. Tavenner. Going back for a moment to Sara Dolgin: did you say that she was a housing manager?

Mr. Nolan. She is at present a housing manager.

Mr. Tavenner. She is at present?

Mr. Nolan. Right.

Mr. Tavenner. All right. Proceed.

Mr. Nolan. Lillian Stein, who was in 1946 a housing assistant, provisional housing assistant in the employ of the New York City Housing Authority, admitted to me after we recognized one another as carrying the same line, the Communist Party line, of being a member of the Communist Party.

She also stated, if you might call this in the form of bragging or what you might term it as, but she brought it up very strongly to me that the Soviet Union was doing some wonderful and she herself had taught English over in the Soviet Union. How true it was I don't know but I accepted it as

being the truth.

Mr. Scherer. What was that woman's name?

Mr. Nolan. Lillian Stein.

Mr. Scherer. Did she testify?

(At this point, Mr. Moulder withdrew from the hearing room.)

Mr. Tavenner. No.

What was her married name?

Mr. Nolan. She is married to Gerard F. Jansen, whom I previously named as being a member of my cell. She resigned under fire from the New York Housing Authority about a year ago as I am now correcting it from approximately two years ago to one year.

In her case, going back to 1946, this Lillian Stein was willing to carry out anything that the United Public Workes wanted to have achieved in terms of through the union into the housing authority.

There was one other person, a Frank Kessler, who had been a painter with me in the New York City Housing Authority since 1942. I had worked with him as a painter in '46 and '47 and in the course of a day's work of painting we would constantly all day be discussing communism. He was a member of his neighborhood branch in Washington Heights and I don't know whether he remained in the Party after or what happened to him in that particular relationship but he had transferred

from the New York City Housing Authority over to the Hunter College Board of Higher Education as a painter. I believe he is still employed there but, again, it is one of those exchanges of identity.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you recall any other person in this category? Do you recall a person by the name of Dorothy Hammerman?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, Dorothy Hammerman, going back to 1942, was very active when we had first jointed the State, County, and Municipal Workers which was the name prior to the United Public Workers and she identified herself not openly as a member of the Communist Party at that time but she carried the Communist Party line.

I recognized it in 1942 when I was not a member, but getting back to 1946 she became very active in the United Public Workers and at that time identified herself to me as a member of the Communist Party.

I never approached her as to transferring over into our branch and never had too many discussions with her about her activity in the Communist Party but we generally spoke of the business of the Communist Party, the line of selling Daily Workers. I mean it is hard to recall the incident in particular.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you acquainted with the Communist Party organization on a higher level than your immediate cell, say, the section group of the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. Well, I was acquainted only to the extent that

I had attended a section meeting and had met the section organizer.

Mr. Tavenner. Who was he?

Mr. Nolan. It was a she. I am sorry to say I don't remember her name. As a matter of fact I don't even recall her name. I don't remember if she even told me her name. It was Comrade Helen. That is the way she was introduced and I never bothered to find out what was her last name or anything else.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you recall any other persons on the section level?

Mr. Nolan. No, offhand I don't, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. Tavenner. Do you have any knowledge of the operation of Tenant Leagues?

Mr. Nolan. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Of the New York City Housing Authority?

Mr. Nolan. I was acquainted in this sense: that we as members of the United Public Workers would have at various times an issue between the management of the City Housing and ourselves as employees in the Authority and also as members of Local 111 of the United Public Workers.

Whatever the issue was sometimes we would need the support of, say, outside people, outside the realm of Local 111.

Then we would call upon or try to get the assistance of the Tenant Leagues to support us.

I remember one incident where Sara Dolgin -- there were some

painters being terminated, provisional painters at that time that were being terminated, and Sara Dolgin had suggested at a few of the meetings of the committee that was set up of the painters to contact the Tenants League in Queensbridge Houses and see if they wouldn't send a barrage of telegrams to the City Housing officials condemning this action that they had taken to terminate a number of provisionals.

It was something that Sara Dolgin seemed to know the people who were active in the Tenants League in Queensbridge and they could get their support at almost any time they wished.

Mr. Tavenner. The Queensbridge organization has been placed on the Attorney General's list, has it not?

Mr. Nolan. At later years, yes.

Going back to names of people I said were in the Communist Party cell I belonged to, I forgot to mention the name of Abbot Wolfson, W-o-l-f-s-o-n, who was employed at that time in the New York City Housing Authority as an engineer and today is still employed by the New York City Housing Authority and has the title, I think, of Superintendent of Construction.

Mr. Tavenner. He has admitted his former Communist Party membership and is here as a witness today, is he not?

Mr. Nolan. That is true.

He also was an active member in Local 111 of the United Public Workers.

Mr. Tavenner. Now the question that I had in mind related

to matters of preference in admissions as tenants in the Housing Authority. Do you know of any instance in which, from your best belief, Communist Party membership had any influence upon the proper authorities in admissions as a tenant?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, that particular incident concerns myself. After being discharged from the U. S. Navy, there was a housing shortage and I had been living in a furnished room while my wife and child were living in overcrowded quarters with her mother, my mother-in-law.

This went on, I would say, for about five months, and it was very depressing to me to be living in a furnished room and, consequently, I mentioned it to Gerard F. Jansen about my personal problem.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir, I was a member of the Communist Party at that time. I mentioned this to Gerard F. Jansen about my personal problem of living apart from my family and if I could only get an apartment maybe I would feel a lot better about this.

He said, "Well, do you think some of your problems would be solved if you get an apartment?"

I said, "I certainly do."

He said, "Well, I will tell you what. I'll see if I can't speak to somebody and see what we can do about it." He saw me later.
few days

Mr. Tavenner. Let me ask you this first. At that particular time was there a waiting list for admission as tenants?

Mr. Nolan. There was a terrific waiting list. I would say it ran at least 70,000 people over all the city now. I am saying a waiting list. There might have been 70,000 people accepted on the basis of eligible tenants to public housing and therefore were 70,000 people on the rolls as eligible tenants acceptable to the New York City Housing Authority as tenants, not necessarily 70,000 apartments.

Mr. Tavenner. All right.

Mr. Nolan. As I say, after presenting this problem to him in discussion he said he would see what he could do about it and a few days later he approached me and said, "I have gotten you an apartment."

I said, "That is fine. Where is it?"

He said, "It is in Bruckner Houses." Bruckner Houses happens to be located on Bruckner Boulevard in the Bronx. It is up around Boynton Avenue, LaFayette Avenue. They are Quonset hut type of houses. They used them during World War I to build temporary quarters for service men overseas.

He said, "I got you an apartment at Bruckner Houses." He said, "I talked to Sonia Osler," who was the manager at the time in East River Houses. He said, "She has talked to the manager of Bruckner. All you have to do is bring your

wife up there and you have got an apartment. Go up and take care of it."

He set the appointment of, I believe, it was Thursday. I don't know the exact date or month. I believe it was somewhere in July of '47 on a Thursday morning about eleven o'clock that I went to Bruckner Houses with my wife and we went into the manager there. Today he is presently a supervising manager in the New York City Housing Authority.

Mr. Kearney. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. I could not say he attended meetings with me but from other Communists I was informed he was a member of the Communist Party, but again we get into a kind of three-way conversation as to how he was a member. I mean through other Communist Party members he was a Party member but I couldn't actually say I saw him in meetings.

As I say, Gerard F. Jansen contacted Sonia Osler, who in turn contacted Harold Berger.

These people were both managers, one of them the manager of East River, the other a manager of Bruckner. It was recognized by Jansen that Sonia was a Party member. How he knew of her as a Party member I don't know.

Mr. Tavenner. That is the hearsay testimony I was referring to.

Mr. Nolan. He referred to me that she was a member of the Party, that Sonia was a member of the Party, and he would

contact her and she would know who to contact.

She in turn contacted Harold Berger.

This project, Bruckner Houses, had been just opening up. There were maybe a couple of hundred people presently in the dwellings and say maybe another five hundred to open up.

Mr. Berger, upon meeting him at the Bruckner Houses, I had met him previously as a member of the United Public Workers and I had seen him in the capacity as manager. I sat down, I sat down and introduced my wife, and we talked about getting an apartment.

"Unfortunately," he said, "I don't have anything right now," he says, "but I will put you on a waiting list."

So I thought, "Well, gee, I thought this thing was all cleared."

At that point someone walked in his office and put a paper in front of him and then he said, "Gee, are you in luck. I just had a cancellation."

He took me in a jeep, my wife and myself in a jeep and took us down to this Quonset hut and showed us this empty half of a Quonset hut, and we looked at it, and he said, "Do you like it? Do you want it?"

We said, "Yes," and he took us back and we filled out the papers. I gave him a deposit, and moved in a few weeks later.

Mr. Kearney. How much was your rent?

Mr. Nolan. \$33.50.

Mr. Kearney. How many rooms?

Mr. Nolan. As they classified it, four rooms.

Mr. Kearney. One bedroom?

Mr. Nolan. Two bedrooms and bath. The bath was a stall shower, one of those prefabricated setups. The living room and kitchen was the ovalness of a Quonset hut, and a short partition that was backed up by an oil heater on one side and a pipe stove and a hot water heater on the other side and, that was the extent of your living room and kitchen classification; they classified it on the books as a four room apartment. That is the way in that one particular instance that through the Communist Party I feel that I got an apartment and that I jumped a lot of people that were on the waiting list, as I had not even had my name in.

(At this point, Mr. Moulder entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Kearney. In other words, the placing of that sheet of paper in front of the manager was a part of the act?

Mr. Nolan. I believe it was for the benefit of my wife, who was not a Party member and didn't know anything about me being a Party member.

Another point to prove the role of Sonia Osler as I knew her was she passed the word to Jansen at one time that my immediate superior, a Mr. Birmingham, was out after my skin and you better tip him off." She didn't know me but she knew Jansen through the Party and told him he better tell Nolan that

the boss is looking for his hide.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, will you tell us, Mr. Nolan, the circumstances under which you left the Communist Party?

Mr. Nolan. I will tell you the factual circumstances under which I left the Party. I left the Communist Party because I seen that they had been making deals, you might say, with city officials. I m not classifying these deals as right or wrong. They had been made these deals. They would sell some one group out to benefit another group and that in turn might have been better for the union. It would have put the union in a better position.

(At this point, Mr. Kearney withdrew from the hearing room.)

Mr. Nolan. For example, I felt that they had sold out my particular group that I represented, the painters. They didn't present any opposition to the housing authority when they were terminating these painters. They put up a very token resistance and didn't seem to be interested. In other words, we didn't seem to be of any value to them and they didn't seem to be interested. They were interested in another group.

It was very evident to me that they would make a deal with anybody to benefit this union and in turn benefit the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, Manny Sherman, who was the organizer for the Local 111 at the time had told me, "Yes," he said, "I am a little suspicious of some of these things myself because, as a paid organizer, I am entitled to sit in a meeting," and,

he says, "Bigel let me sit in the hall while he talked to the Commissioner and then he came out and said, 'It's all set.'"

He didn't say what was set and how it was set. He was suspicious. He didn't say what Commissioner. He didn't say what department.

As I say, that is factual. This was evident, very strongly evident to me that they do business with anybody for their own ends.

As a result, it was only a question of time until I just dropped out of the whole thing completely.

Now, of course, this statement I am going to make is not necessarily factual but I was dismissed by the New York City Housing Authority.

This dismissal happened approximately five years after I had left the Communist Party and left the union and I feel that this dismissal -- I can't prove it. That is why I say I am only putting it on record for one reason, and that is that maybe you people would be interested in knowing how they can work and do work, that they waited for me to build up a record against myself. Normally, in the practice of civil service, when a person is doing something like he is not regular in attendance you generally suspend him, or you use some minor disciplinary measures to try to bring him into line. They never suspended me. Just one day they hit me right on the head and said, "Don't go back to work until you have a hearing."

After I was told that Gerard F. Jansen, whom I had been a member with in the Communist Party and who had known I had broken with the Communist Party and with whom I had a disagreement on the situation that existed in Korea, I had voiced my opinion very strongly against the Communist Party and against the situation in Korea, I feel he brought that word back to Mr. Bigel. I also feel that after that the word went out, "We have got to get rid of him."

He knew I was in disagreement with him and knew he couldn't sic call me a friend no more. Yet, at the time of my dismissal, prior to my dismissal, he interjected himself into the scene and said, "You don't have to worry about a thing. You will get off with a light sentence," and this and that and the other thing, and asked me who my lawyer was, and I told him and the name is Morris Reisberger, so called Civil Service expert lawyer that is, and he had to have a private conference with him explaining to him how he was going to show this lawyer how to defeat the charges against me.

Mr. Tavenner. This is Jansen?

Mr. Nolan. This is Jansen. He had this private conference with this Morris Reisberger, and I called him up a few days later and then I called the lawyer and he said, "I am in agreement with Jansen that you plead guilty and throw yourself on the mercy of the court and maybe they will let you off with a suspension." That didn't happen.

I concurred in what my lawyer had advised me to do and pleaded guilty to whatever they said I was guilty of and then I found out I hung myself. They had no mercy. They just said, "You are dismissed", period.

To that extent I say, and I can't prove it, -- that is unfortunate -- that the Communist Party is instrumental in that extent that they can go in and go right up to top officials and I don't know how they manipulated it. That again I can't prove but I am convinced that that is what happened.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you subsequently reemployed?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. In the same position?

Mr. Nolan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. After how long a period of time?

Mr. Nolan. Well, after ten months of being out of the employ of the City Housing through the intercession of some people that I had known they had approached and interceded for me through the chairman of the Housing Authority to take me back, that it was an unfortunate situation and finally, after much pressure being put on the chairman of the Authority, they hired me as a provisional, which is not a reinstatement because provisional, in terms of civil service, has no status, no security. You can just tell him he is terminated and he doesn't need anything. He is finished.

So I had nothing except they satisfied the request of those

people interested in seeing I got my job back. They satisfied that request and said, "We will put him back to work." They didn't say how. They said, "We will leave him on trial and see how he works out."

O.K. I worked out and they still didn't want to put me back.

Mr. Rechenik, who is the Chief of Personnel in the New York City Housing Authority, told Mr. Cruise it was impossible to reinstate me under civil service law and yet I had a copy in my pocket and I have at home in my files a letter from Dr. Schaeffer of the Civil Service Commission, who in reply to my question as to my possibility of being reinstated said that under Section so and so of the law, I could be reinstated. Of course, that is a little bit of old history.

Mr. Tavenner. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Moulder. The witness is excused.

We wish to express to you our gratitude and appreciation of your cooperation and the information which you have given this committee.

Mrs. Osler. I was a social investigator for the Department of Welfare.

Mr. Tavenner. Who was your superior or superiors?

Mrs. Osler. I really for the moment can't recall. I think, well I don't know if I should say my guess. I don't remember. I really don't.

Mr. Tavenner. Over how long a period of time were you so employed?

Mrs. Osler. About ten or eleven months.

Mr. Tavenner. Can you describe your position a little more clearly to us as to what office you worked out of or give us some better description than just merely that of-- did you say investigator?

Mrs. Osler. Social Investigator.

Excuse me a minute.

Mr. Tavenner. Certainly.

(Witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Osler. I carried a case load of 50 to 60 recipients of public welfare and was in charge of a little territory and it was my job to see to it that these recipients received public assistance only so long as they maintained eligibility.

It was also my job to see that applicants for assistance were granted assistance only if they were eligible.

Mr. Tavenner. What was that territory to which you were assigned?

Mr. Scherer. Before we go further, let the record show that the House is not sitting today.

Mr. Rand. I am sorry. I did not know. I assumed it was.

Mr. Scherer. I just talked to Washington.

Mrs. Osler. I am sorry. I don't remember your question.

Mr. Tavenner. Let me state it over.

You stated that you were connected as an employee of the New York City Housing Authority. What project of the Authority was it that you were connected with?

Mrs. Osler. I worked for several projects during my employment with the Authority.

Mr. Tavenner. What were they?

Mrs. Osler. Red Hook Houses, Edwin Markham, East River, and Jacob Riis.

Mr. Tavenner. Over how long a period of time were you connected with these particular housing projects?

Mrs. Osler. For ten years.

Mr. Tavenner. That would go back to approximately 1939?

Mrs. Osler. That is correct.

Mr. Tavenner. Were you employed by the City Government prior to that time?

Mrs. Osler. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Was it in Public Welfare?

Mrs. Osler. That is correct.

Mr. Tavenner. What was the character of your employment there?

as I would have explained to you in a few moments, certain Communist Party activities within, among employees of the City Government with special reference to public housing and also public works.

The committee had understood that you having held the position for a period of time as Housing Manager under the New York City Authority may have some information that the committee desires to have.

Mr. Moulder. And use in connection with legislation which the committee has under consideration.

Mr. Rand. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, whether the committee sitting here at a time when I believe the House of Representatives is in session in Washington has procured special leave to sit under the Legislative Reorganization Act?

Mr. Tavenner. No, the committee has not obtained such authority but this committee is given specific authority in the Act establishing it to so sit whether the House is in session or not.

That same question has been raised before.

Mr. Rand. I understand, and it is still pending, of course, in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Moulder. The committee will suspend for just one moment.

Mr. Tavenner. I believe my question was what project was it that you were connected with.

Mrs. Osler. No.

Mr. Tavenner. Have you taught at Baltimore in some other institution?

Mrs. Osler. I have.

Mr. Tavenner. What was that?

Mrs. Osler. The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Mr. Tavenner. How long have you lived in Baltimore?

Mrs. Osler. Since September, 1949.

Mr. Tavenner. Prior to that did you live in the city of New York?

Mrs. Osler. I did.

Mr. Tavenner. What was the nature of your employment in New York?

Mrs. Osler. Just prior to coming to Baltimore?

Mr. Tannever. Yes.

Mrs. Osler. I was in Housing Management.

Mr. Tavenner. Was that a part of the New York City Housing Authority?

Mrs. Osler. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. What particular project was it with which you were connected?

Mrs. Osler. May I please ask a question?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes.

Mrs. Osler. What is the nature of this inquiry?

Mr. Tavenner. This committee is undertaking to investigate,

Mr. Tavenner. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. Moulder. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this congressional subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. Osler. I do.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you state your name, please?

TESTIMONY OF MRS. SONIA OSLER,
6225 WOODACRES AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND,
ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL: HARRY I. RAND,
WYATT BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Osler. Sonia Osler.

Mr. Tavenner. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel.

Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. Rand. Harry I. Rand, Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell us your address, please, and your occupation?

Mrs. Osler. 6225 Woodacres Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.

I am a psychologist by occupation.

Mr. Tavenner. Are you at the present time teaching in any institution in or near Baltimore?

Mrs. Osler. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. What institution?

Mrs. Osler. Goucher, G-O-U-C-H-E-R, College.

Mr. Tavenner. Are you also a teacher in another institution?

Mrs. Osler. I guess it was some place in Harlem.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, you responded to your name as Mrs.

Sonia Osler. You are Dr. Sonia Osler?

Mrs. Osler. That is right.

Mr. Tavenner. You hold your degree in what branch?

Mrs. Osler. Psychology.

Mr. Tavenner. Psychology. What is your married name?

Mrs. Osler. Osler.

Mr. Tavenner. Osler is your married name?

Mrs. Osler. That is right.

Mr. Tavenner. Have you had any other married name before the name of Osler?

Mrs. Osler. Just excuse me a minute.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Osler. Yes, I did.

Mr. Tavenner. What was the name?

Mrs. Osler. Wright.

Mr. Tavenner. You were the wife of George B. Wright?

Mrs. Osler. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Who is Mr. Abraham Osolsky?

Mrs. Osler. That is my present husband who had originally that name and then it was changed to Osler.

Mr. Tavenner. That explains my difficulty.

Mrs. Osler. All right.

Mr. Tavenner. Dr. Osler is your professional name?

Mrs. Osler. Yes.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you tell the committee, please, whether during the period when you were an employee of the New York City Authority, you were aware of the existence of any organized group of the Communist Party in which civil employees of the City of New York were members?

Mrs. Osler. I am declining to answer this question and I would like to offer the following reasons for my declination: I think that the work of this committee over the past twenty-odd years has injured this nation and I am very reluctant and unwilling to participate in any part of its work.

Mr. Scherer. Madam, that is no reason. You may think that but that is no legal reason for your refusing to answer.

Mrs. Osler. May I offer some other reasons?

Mr. Scherer. You may offer your constitutional grounds but whether you like the committee or not or what you feel its effect has been upon the nation is certainly no legal reason for you refusing to answer.

We recognize that you have certain constitutional rights to refuse to answer but let us not deal in those other reasons.

Mrs. Osler. I also feel that this question may not be relevant at the present time especially since I have been away from the Authority since 1949, and I further would like to avail myself of the privileges granted to me by the Consti-

tution in declining to answer.

Mr. Scherer. Which provisions of the Constitution? There are hundreds.

Mrs. Osler. All right. I would like to take the privileges accorded in the Constitution itself and several of its amendments, namely, the first, the fifth, the sixth, and the ninth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Tavenner. In basing your refusal to answer in part upon the fifth amendment, do you intend to include that part of the fifth amendment which provides against self-incrimination?

Mrs. Osler. Among other parts I include that part.

Mr. Scherer. What was the question you asked, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. Tavenner. The question, in substance, was whether or not during the period she was employed by the New York City Authority she was aware of the existence of an organized group of the Communist Party made up of civil employees of the City Government.

Mrs. Osler, during the period that I have referred to, were you yourself a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. Osler. I will decline to answer or am declining to answer this on the same grounds. Am I required to repeat the grounds?

Mr. Moulder. No, you are not.

Mr. Tavenner. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mrs. Osier. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. Tavenner. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Moulder. I have no questions.

The witness is excused.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Smith.

Mr. Moulder. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Smith. I do.

Mr. Tavenner. You are Mr. Herman J. Smith?

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN J. SMITH,
160 WEST 174th STREET, APARTMENT 15-G,
BRONX 53, NEW YORK.

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Will you state your occupation, your residence, and your age?

Mr. Smith. I am a civil engineer. My residence is 160 West 174th Street, Apartment 15-G, Bronx 53, New York. I am now thirty-nine years of age.

Mr. Tavenner. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel.

Mr. Smith. No, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. It is the practice of the committee to advise a witness that he is entitled to a counsel if he desires it.

Mr. Smith. I intend to tell the truth so I do not think I need anybody.

Mr. Tavenner. You are a civil engineer in the Department of Public Works for the City of New York, are you not?

Mr. Smith. That is right, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. How long have you been so employed?

Mr. Smith. I entered employment of the Department of Public Works July 5, 1951 as a junior civil engineer, provisional.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Smith, it came to the attention of the staff of the committee that you had at one time and for a very short period of time been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. And that you have had an experience as a city employee which should afford this committee some valuable information?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. Let us begin by asking you to tell us, first, your educational background and then tell us how you got into the Communist Party.

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir. My educational background, sir, consists of two years at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in liberal arts.

I also studied for a couple of years at the State University of Iowa in mechanical engineering, and I had a change of heart after the war was over and I decided I wanted to be a civil engineer and thanks to the G.I. Bill of Rights, I was able to go to Manhattan College and received my degree in civil engineering on the 13th of June, 1951.

Upon leaving Manhattan College, I briefly went into the employment of the Department of Marine Aviation for a couple of

weeks, but I didn't feel that the line of work that was offered there would develop me sufficiently as an engineer, and, as a result, I went to the Public Works Department, where I had previously filed an application, on the 5th of July, 1951. Of course, in this time I have moved up through the ranks of the engineers there.

On the 16th of March, 1952, I was appointed to the permanent title of Civil Engineering Draftsman as a result of passing a competitive examination in December, 1951.

The first of October, 1953, I was advanced to the provisional title of Assistant Civil Engineer and put on leave of absence from my lower title of civil engineering draftsman and on the 16th of March, 1954, I was appointed to the permanent title of Assistant Civil Engineer as a result of passing competitive examinations in a promotional setup of the City of New York and on the 1st of February, 1957, I was appointed to the permanent title of Civil Engineer as a result of a promotional examination and also in between of receiving my professional engineering license from the State of New York in May, 1956.

Briefly, that is my engineering career.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, most of the information that we desire does not relate to the period of your Communist Party membership and because the committee is very much pressed for time, I am going to ask you to describe to us just briefly the extent to

which communism entered into the procurement of your first position within the City Government in New York.

Mr. Smith. The extent to which communism entered into it?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes, or in what way communism was connected with it.

Mr. Smith. Well, as far as my position with New York City, I would have to go back to the Federal Government, of course, in the post office. I was called up on loyalty charges and there was a hearing in March, 1949, and at this hearing I would like to say that I never will forget the words of the counsel or at least the head of the committee who told me that they were not calling me in to persecute me, prosecute me in any way as you might say, but they were calling me in to help me and wanted to find out if they could help me, and they gave me a very fair hearing, and I think I wrote them all letters thanking them for it.

I received a letter later from the Loyalty Review Board in Washington, D. C. declaring me eligible for appointment as a postal clerk substitute in the New York City Post Office.

Now, as far as the City of New York is concerned, the issue of communism didn't come up in employment until I applied for permanent status.

My first permanent appointment was as a civil engineering draftsman March 16, 1952, and on that application the question arose was I ever a member of the Communist Party, and so forth,

and, of course, I told them I was.

At the investigation I told them about the Federal situation and I answered all the questions that were put to me.

The second time that the communism came up was after my permanent promotion to Assistant Civil Engineer, and after that promotion I was called to the Commissioner of Investigations Office of the City of New York and I was asked certain questions there and, of course, apparently I answered all the questions to their satisfaction as I am still employed by the City of New York.

Briefly, as far as my employment is concerned, sir, until this committee called me that is all.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, in order to make the answer to my question a little plainer, I believe I will have to go back.

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. You had been a member of the Communist Party over what period of time?

Mr. Smith. I was a member of the Communist Party, I paid dues in the year 1943. At the time I was employed at the Sun Shipyard in Chester, Pennsylvania. My activities there briefly consisted of attending about four meetings during the summer and spring of 1943.

After returning from the service I had an incident that happened in which I paid dues for the year '46 and, of course, I never attended a meeting. I got cards and so forth.

Mr. Tavenner. What were those circumstances?

Mr. Smith. The circumstances were these. I wanted to get in college as most fellows wanted to do and, of course, that is a very difficult thing to do and as a result I applied at Columbia, at Brooklyn Polytech, and N.Y.U, and so forth, and even the schools outside the city, and I was told, of course, by most of them that they were crowded and at NYU they told me that I could enter in February of '47. However, I wanted to enter right away.

As a result, I was up at 135th Street in the Library and I discovered about Manhattan College. I was talking with the fellow at 135th Street Library and we were discussing colleges and so forth, and this gentleman mentioned Ben Davis, who was on the City Council of New York at that time.

I went to Ben Davis' office which was around the corner. At that time I was living on 136th Street between Lenox Avenue and Seventh, and Ben Davis' office was upstairs on 135th Street between 7th and 8th on the second floor of the building on the corner.

I went up and I went in with the intention of asking him to help me get into City College since he was an official of the City of New York.

Mr. Tavenner. He was a member of the Council of the City of New York?

Mr. Smith. That is right. He was a member of the City

Council at that time. Being a Negro, and he was available there right around the corner, I thought that I could have better luck there.

Of course, Mr. Davis promptly told me that he thought that the best thing to do to show that I was an alert young man would be to join the Communist Party. Foolishly, I gave him 50 cents and he brought out a card.

I would like to say that I never saw Mr. Davis again after that. I never went back.

I received cards over a period of six or eight months from a Lincoln Douglas Club. I later was told that the Lincoln Douglas Club was the Communist affiliate up at City College.

I never attended a meeting of that organization. In fact, I think it was several days after that that I had a little experience and I am very thankful that I had it. I didn't know what to do.

At that time, I didn't know anyone, hardly, in New York City, and I had just gotten married. My wife was pregnant and I wanted to get in school.

So I thought that I would try praying a little, so I walked out from my house on 136th Street and I turned the corner and walked down 7th Avenue. When I got to 132nd Street, just walking arbitrarily, something said, "Why don't you go in this church and pray." I went in St. Aloysius and they have a statue of Our Lady of Lourdes, and I went before that

statue and prayed and asked for guidance. I got up and I walked out of there and I walked back to 7th Avenue and, well, something said, "Walk north on 7th," so I walked north on 7th. When I got to 142nd Street, I looked up and saw St. Charles Church. I had been to mass there once or twice.

I said, "Maybe this priest will help me if I tell him the story about trying to get into Manhattan College." In fact, I had been there the day before and they told me they didn't have room. I walked into the rectory at St. Charles and when I walked in the lady answered the door and at that time Monsignor McCann was pastor, and I asked to see Monsignor McCann. The lady told me that he was resting upstairs, would I see another priest. I told her "yes."

Father Scanlon came down and I told him I wanted to get in Manhattan College, but I went up and they told me they were crowded and I felt that a letter from the ^{priest} press would help. He said, "Just a minute. I will go and see the Monsignor. The Monsignor just got an honorary degree from Manhattan College and maybe he can help you."

He went upstairs to see the Monsignor and he came back with a letter with the Monsignor's signature on it recommending me to the Dean, Brother Leo.

I took the letter there and that was the beginning of my success. I was in Manhattan College and I never saw Mr. Davis again or any of the other people.

Mr. Tavenner. And in 1946 you did not attend the meeting and have not attended one since?

Mr. Smith. No, sir. The last meeting I attended of the Communist Party, sir, was in the summer of 1943.

Mr. Tavenner. Now, if you were not a member of the Communist Party during the period of your employment by the City Government, how is it that you can be of help to this committee? Is it not a fact that you were able to observe two persons, one by the name of Sklar and one by the name of Fink, who have been identified as Communists and one of whom at least was your superior?

Mr. Smith. I remember Mr. Sklar very well, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. And that you can enlighten this committee as to the opportunities that those people had or would have in the event of national emergency because of the positions that they hold?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tavenner. I wish you would describe that to the committee briefly.

Mr. Smith. When I entered the Department of Public Works, sir, in July, 1931, I was introduced to the Section Chief, a Mr. Barish and Mr. Barish, of course, being a section chief, took me to his assistant, a Mr. Lewis Sklar, Mr. Lewis Sklar appeared to be a very friendly man and he gave me my first assignments. I noticed that he took a special interest in me.

For instance, in design work he would work very closely with me, and, however, I found that his approach had a familiar ring to me. In other words, it was actually identical I would say to the Communists that I had encountered in the shipyard and in fact I will go so far as to say that with Mr. Sklar, the only difference was he didn't show me a card to say that "I am out to recruit for the Communist Party."

That was the impression that I immediately got from Mr. Sklar.

Well, he wanted to know where I had been and, of course, he found out in turn that I had worked in the shipyard in Pennsylvania, and so forth, and all.

He in turn became interested in speaking of labor unions and, well, it put me in somewhat of a difficult position. Actually, from the beginning, I wouldn't say I hated the man, because my father, even before I became a Catholic, who was a Protestant, taught us not to hate even in the south where we came from. We were told that we were no better than people that we hated and we were never taught to hate, so I couldn't have hated him in view of my religion, but I will say that he was very repulsive because he symbolized to me everything that those people who had approached me in the deceptive manner that they did in Pennsylvania symbolized and to me he appeared as an individual who would not hesitate to take the maximum advantage of me and to use me in any way that he possibly could.

However, I had to restrain myself because of Mr. Sklar's

strategic position in office.

In other words, if I was to learn anything about engineering in the job, if I made an enemy of Mr. Sklar right away things might have been different, so I tolerated these discussions. The discussions centered around, we will say, labor unions, for instance, for one. He found out that I had been in the labor union in the shipyard and so forth.

At that time, the American labor unions were finding out who the Communists were and, of course, they were kicking them out of the unions and he vigorously defended the Communists and the American labor movement. In other words, he said they were actually the basis of the true labor union movement in America.

Not only did he do that but time and again he would hold up the unions of the Soviet Union as a model of unionism, of people who are truly interested in labor and sometimes I would have to dodge him at lunch time to keep from going to the same restaurant where he would go because he was so intent on getting these points over, and so forth, and even at work at the end of work I would dodge him sometimes to keep from riding the same subway uptown. He rode the Lexington Avenue train up to Grand Central Station where he went to Westchester to his home. Then there were such things as the racial discrimination problem.

Of course, I am aware that there is a racial discrimination

and, of course, I imagine that as long as you have got two people of different races there will be some dispute probably unless heaven comes to earth, but his model was that in the Soviet Union and under the type of government that existed in the Soviet Union that there could be no racial discrimination, that racial discrimination was a result of the capitalist system in America, and he said that as long as there was a capitalist system in America we would continue to have racial discrimination. Well, of course, I am not a person who will defend racial discrimination. I wouldn't be a man if I did that, but, however, I would point out certain things to Mr. Sklar that I had observed and I have traveled quite a bit in America.

For instance, I told him about an insurance company in my home town, the Universal Life Insurance Company. When we moved from Arkansas to Memphis in 1923, the Universal Life Insurance Company was just beginning to get on its feet. In fact, they were so poor that the president of that company had to come to our house on Florida Street and examine us when we took our policies in the Universal Life Insurance Company, and I pointed out to him that although it was in an area where race relations weren't the best that this man, Dr. Walker, was able to build an insurance company that has millions of dollars in assets today and has over \$100 million worth of insurance in effect and who, in the late forties or early fifties, were

able to build an insurance company office in Memphis where they paid \$750,000 cash for their office, and I would point out that although there are some things wrong that it wasn't the picture that he painted.

I told him that as a Negro I thought that I knew more about the situation than he did.

Then I also pointed out the fact that often conditions exist because individuals may be satisfied with the trend of things in their particular locality, and I told him that I would think that if any change was desired that it should be initiated by those people and not by agitators in any way to change that.

Well, there are any number of things. For instance, I would point out to him the fact that even in myself, my grandfather was born in slavery in Alabama, Bullock County I believe it was, and he died only in '56. It was November of 1956. He was born in 1861.

I pointed out to him that although my father was only able to get a seventh grade education and my mother was only able to go to the third grade, that in this country I was able to become a professional engineer and that my brother is a dentist, and that those are things that in many of the European countries it is not as easy to climb that fast, and there are any number of other things. For instance, the fact that in the south today in the various universities and colleges where Negroes attend

and then there are many integrated schools where they are attending, that in those schools you have more Negroes getting a college education than you do in many countries of considerable size, and the picture in my estimate was not the kind of picture that Mr. Sklar would have that we were persecuted.

I told him that was especially true in New York where I couldn't see anything to keep me back.

Then, these things would go on. It is very difficult to explain it to you because it was over a period of months where this went on and, well, Mr. Sklar continued his various methods of trying to get over different points. When he wouldn't come with labor unions and racial discrimination, he would try to incorporate such things as, say, government. In government he would say that the two party system was a farce in this country, that actually the country was run by people in Wall Street, and your vote, regardless of which way it went, didn't mean anything.

Of course, I remember very clearly pointing out to Mr. Sklar one day. I said "If in this country the two party system is no good I want to know how President Truman got to be President of the United States." I told him he was opposed by the Republican Party. He was opposed by the Progressives on the left, and much of the Democrat Party opposed him. I said, "Yet he got to be elected President of the United States. That looks like the voice of the people to me."

Besides, I told him it was difficult for me to understand how an engineer, a man who is required to think logically, could say that a one party system that handed out a single slate to an electorate, could be a Democratic setup as he would point out with respect to the Soviet Union.

Do you wish me to continue, sir?

Mr. Tavenner. I believe this would be a good place to break in your testimony.

What I would like for you now on your return to tell us about is just what opportunities a person now in the position that Sklar held on other similar positions would have in the event of a great national emergency, what knowledge they would have so as to give this committee an idea of the importance of the field that you are in.

Mr. Smith. Yes.

(Whereupon, at 3:00 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 3:55 p.m., the same day.)

Mr. Scherer. Mr. Chairman, I move that the balance of the witness' statement be incorporated in the record so that we can read it at our leisure in view of the fact that we wish to adjourn at this time.

Mr. Moulder. Without objection, that will be done.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Mr. Moulder. May we say to you that we are very proud of you and your loyalty to your country and we certainly are grateful and appreciative of the information which you have given the committee.

Mr. Smith. I thank you, sir.

I wish to say that I am proud of my country, too. As a veteran of World War II, I certainly appreciate the way that I was treated and the courtesy that I got and the good treatment from the Loyalty Board that understood my problem, and so forth, and the way I was treated.

Mr. Moulder. There could be no question about your tremendous loyalty.

Mr. Smith. Thank you very much.

Mr. Scherer. We only wish there were more Americans like you.

Mr. Smith. Thank you, sir. Anything I can do I will be glad to do.

Mr. Moulder. The committee will adjourn.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

Statement prepared by Det. Mildred V. Blauvelt, Bur. of Special Services,
N.Y.C. Police Dept., for executive session of House Comm. on Un-American
Activities, May 9, 1958.

Housing Projects, i.e., low-cost projects, are regarded as concentrations by the Communist Party.

According to communist definition, concentration is a Leninist method of work, i.e., Party activities are to be conducted in specified areas, such as working class areas, nationality groups, racial groups, etc., for the purpose of propagandizing the Party line.

A low-cost housing project, because of the socio-economic status or level of its tenants, fulfills the Party's requirements for a concentration. Here, in one designated area, the Party finds the low-income group, the working-class group, the racial groups or so-called minority groups, and those on relief, all of whom the communists hope to convince are being exploited and in whom they hope to nurture the seeds of dissatisfaction, so that they will turn to the Communist Party as the defender of human rights and the only organization, according to Party representations, interested in jobs, higher wages and equality for all. These are the people whom the communists hope to influence to carry the Party line to their shops, factories, union, social groups, even churches, by first reaching them in their homes with Party propaganda on the basic issues of their daily living, on so-called civil rights issues, and on the issue of peace.

Party activity in housing projects is conducted through the technique of agit-prop, or agitational propaganda, which is the tactic of first educating the people how to think on a particular issue and then agitating them into taking specific action. This takes the form of the distribution of leaflets and the circulation of petitions on various issues of particular concern to the Party, especially the issue of peace; getting tenants to participate in delegations to Washington on the issues of rents, housing and price controls, and civil rights; holding demonstrations; canvassing with the Daily and Sunday Worker to establish paper routes and to secure subscriptions.

Party members, and especially those living in housing projects, are under directives to disseminate Party propaganda within the projects, one of the most effective ways being through the Tenants Councils which they organize and control. Although non-communists are sometimes placed in the leadership of these Tenants Councils for the sake of giving them an aura of respectability, the Party members are always on the executive committees, and they receive directives at Party meetings on issues to be projected at Tenant Council meetings. Tenants Councils are actually the sounding board for the Party line.

During my membership in the Communist Party as an undercover operative for the New York City Police Department, I learned of the Party's aims to penetrate and infiltrate into housing projects, the methods used by the communists in their attempt to influence and gain support of the tenants around issues of interest to the Party, and actually participated in carrying out Party directives to make a concentration of a housing project.

One of the housing projects with which I became familiar because of my undercover work in the Communist Party was the Fort Greene Housing Project

in Brooklyn. This Project had been what is called a Section in the organizational structure of the Party until it was merged with the Boro Hall Section in 1949. There were 60 members in the Project, divided into 3 clubs, the Fort Greene Club, the Frederick Douglass Club and the Walt Whitman Club. (Pg. 913 of previous testimony)

The Fort Greene Project has a population of 2,000 to 3,000, and the number of 60 Party members may appear small. However, if we consider the number of Party members in proportion to the total population of Brooklyn, I think we will find that 60 Party members in the Fort Greene Housing Project is a fairly high percentage. For example, Brooklyn has a population of about 3,500,000. The Party, while I was in it, claimed a membership of 5,000 to 6,000 in Brooklyn alone, which would mean that the ratio was less than 2 communists out of every 1,000 population. A similar ratio for some 2,000 to 3,000 in the housing project would mean only about 5 communists in the project. Even if the assumption that people of the socio-economic status living in housing projects are twice as prone to be communists as the people comprising the average population in the entire borough is made, that might give us 10 or 12 communists out of a population of 3,000. But certainly the number of 60 Party members out of the 3,000 persons in the Project is far out of line. It would appear that some factor other than normal percentage of population or susceptibility to communist recruitment would have to account for such a concentration of communists within one housing project. The conclusion that the factor involved is collusion with those who assign apartments in projects seems inescapable.

This Fort Greene Section of the Communist Party operated so openly that it held a rally on April 3, 1947, in the school located in the housing project for the purpose of protesting threats to outlaw the Communist Party. Al Neptune, one of the executive members of the Fort Greene Section, announced that this Section had raised \$1,400 toward the defense fund to be used by the Party to fight this threat. (Pg. 906 of previous testimony)

The Communist Party members in the Fort Greene Housing Project were also members of the Project's Tenants Council, and on several occasions when I was attending Section executive meetings held in the home of one of the Party members in the Project, the executive members of the three clubs in the Project were excused from these meetings in order to attend meetings of the Tenants Council.

At one such Party meeting which I attended, the question was raised as to whether or not the Fort Greene Tenants Council should conduct a Red Cross drive in the Project. The comrades were instructed that the Red Cross drive should not be conducted. The reason given was the propaganda line that the Red Cross segregated the blood of whites and non-whites. This propaganda line served a double purpose - one was to produce racial strife and resentment, while the other purpose was to discredit the Red Cross and make it ineffectual. Knowing the long-range planning of objectives that goes into all communist activities, I feel that the tension that existed in Korea at that time and which resulted in the outbreak of hostilities a few months later was a motivating reason behind this expressed policy. How different it was during World War II when the Soviet was on the side of the United States fighting Hitler! At that time the Communist Party openly conducted campaigns for the Red Cross and urged all to donate blood so that our soldiers might be well supplied with blood to save their lives.

My undercover work in the Communist Party brought me into direct participation in Party activities in the Gowanus Housing Project. In March of 1950 the club of which I was a member, the Jay-Smith Club, was directed to make the Gowanus Housing Project its concentration for Party activities, and the members were to canvass with the Daily and Sunday Workers, and were to conduct leaflet distributions in the Project. (Pg. 892 of previous testimony)

Seven members of the Jay-Smith Club were tenants in the Gowanus Housing Project, and while all were required to be members of the Tenants Council in the Project, two had the specific assignment of being on the executive board of the Council so that they could attend executive meetings and be in a position to direct its policy. Laura Fields was the Secretary of the Council, and inasmuch as she was well versed in Marxist theory, had the task of writing the Council's newspaper so that it had the correct Marxist slant. Nettie Feuer was the Vice-President of the Council, and inasmuch as she was a comparatively new tenant in the Project and had not yet been exposed by word or deed to any suspicion of communist leanings, it became necessary to keep her above suspicion so that whenever the Party wanted a particular activity projected in the Tenants Council, she could do so and no one would suspect its motivations. Ann Bryant, who could not openly participate in Party activities because she was awaiting naturalization and could not jeopardize it, was ordered by the Party to be active in the Tenants Council in furtherance of Party directives. At Party meetings, these comrades would be instructed as to what they should do at the next meeting of the Tenants Council, and when it was felt they were not working effectively, they were criticized and reminded how they were to carry out Party directives.

Party directives to make the Gowanus Housing Project a concentration were strictly adhered to in connection with the Party's spurious campaign for peace. In 1950 when the Party launched its intensive drive based on the circulation of the Stockholm Peace Petition, the Jay-Smith Club faithfully followed orders to flood the housing project with leaflets on peace, and mobilized the membership to canvass every building in the project to secure signatures to the Stockholm Peace Petition. So important was this drive considered that three top-level functionaries of the Brooklyn C.P., namely, Carl Vedro, then the Chairman of the Brooklyn Party; Ben Davis, then the Regional Director of the Waterfront Region; and Margaret Krumbein, Director of the highly selective training cadres conducted by the Party, participated in canvassing the Gowanus Housing Project with the Stockholm Peace Petition. (Pgs. 951-955 in previous testimony)

In 1951 when the communist-front organization for peace, the American Peace Crusade, was launched, right in the midst of the Korean War, the same procedure was followed. The Party members canvassed the Project with peace ballots on the question of bringing our troops back from Korea and for making peace with China, and distributed reprints of a Daily Worker editorial on MacArthur's recall from his command in the Far East, the Korean War, and peace. Concerted canvassing was conducted in the Project to see if any of the tenants could be persuaded to attend the American Peace Crusade's conference for peace to be held in Chicago from June 29 to July 1, 1951, as delegates from the housing project, and the Party members in the Tenants Council had the task of trying to get a member of the Council to attend this peace conference as a delegate of the Gowanus Tenants Council. In addition, the Party members were ordered to see that peace committees were established

among the tenants in the various buildings of the Project, and the communists in the Tenants Council were constantly ordered to project Party propaganda on peace at executive and membership meetings of the Council, relating need for peace to the basic issues of jobs, wages, prices, etc. (Pgs. 9960 of previous testimony)

The ultimate purpose of all of this activity was to recruit the tenants into the C.P., but if that could not be accomplished, the very least the communists hoped to do was to gain support for Party propaganda. The sheer weight of numbers supporting any propaganda campaign, either in the name of the Party, but more usually in the name of a front organization, might give the impression that it was the actual will of the people, and thus serve the Party in projecting its own aims.

I learned also that the housing project in the Red Hook Section was considered important to the Party. I personally knew two of the Party members living in the Red Hook Housing Project, one Blanche Spindell, and the other known only to me as Moishe, who, along with myself, had been especially selected to attend a training cadre conducted by the County Committee of the Brooklyn C.P. under the direction of Margaret Krumbein, whom I consider one of the most dangerous members of the C.P. because of her job to train potential leaders in the Party.

The Red Hook Housing Project was made the center of a demonstration held by the C.P. in its unceasing activity in behalf of Willie McGee, a southern Negro who had received a death sentence for rape. Execution was scheduled for May 8, 1951, and on the evening before, the Party conducted an all-night vigil on the mall of the Red Hook Housing Project demanding a stay of execution. The Party members were notified to participate in the vigil, as well as to call the CBS broadcasting station to demand that the Willie McGee case be included in their news broadcasts in order that this case might be brought to the attention of the people of New York. By this type of activity the Party hoped to whip up racial antagonisms, and draw racial groups closer to the Party by representing itself as the defender of human and civil rights, and as the fighter for justice for the downtrodden.

I believe it was in 1955 that the tenants of the Williamsburg Housing Project became involved in a fight against an act which would have required tenants of housing projects to sign a loyalty oath. This fight was led by a Rebeka Peters. It may be coincidence, but when I attended a Women's Conference for Peace held by the Brooklyn C.P. on May 26, 1951, one of the speakers was introduced as Beckie Peters of Williamsburg.

I knew two members of the LaPassionara Club, the Party's Puerto Rican club in the Boro Hall Section, who were tenants in the Kingsboro Housing Project. It was their particular task to work among the Puerto Ricans to recruit them into the Party.

In view of what I consider the large number of communists living in housing projects, I have often posed the following questions: Is it not significant that so many of them have gotten into the projects? Was there collusion? Were they all taken in chronological order of application? In connection with that particular question I am thinking of Irving and Nettie Feuer who moved from the Bronx to the Gowanus Housing Project in Brooklyn. It was, by the way, in their apartment that the meeting at which I was

expelled from the Party was held. Another question I have posed is why no check was made of their loyalty. It seems to me that it is an imposition upon the American taxpayers that they must subsidize the rents of people who are trying to destroy the American way of life, and I feel that loyalty oaths should be required of the tenants in federal-subsidized housing projects.

The Communist Party views housing projects as a fertile field for the dissemination of its propaganda and for the eventual recruitment of the tenants into the Party. The projects serve as a means of concentrating people into one area so that the communists can work more easily and readily among them with a greater opportunity for success than if these same people were dispersed over a large area. They therefore serve the Party well.